THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THE doctrine of the Trinity is the formula which the Church adopted, and has retained, in order to declare and conserve certain fundamental truths about God which have been revealed in the New Testament. Perhaps we need to be reminded from time to time that it is these truths themselves which are of fundamental importance, but that the words may well be sadly inadequate to the task we lay upon them, though no better ones have been proposed.

No formulae of human words are sufficient to expound the inner nature of God with complete adequacy. At best they are fumbling approximations. When we make even our highest affirmation about the nature of God, we do not pretend to say, 'This is the whole truth.' Rather we claim: 'This at least is true.' How much greater is the full truth which lies beyond our faltering apprehension, we do not know.

The Church has not usually claimed for the doctrine of the Trinity that it is the perfect expression of the whole truth about God, but rather that it is the least unsatisfactory of the possibilities which have been suggested. It is right, therefore, that Christians should remind themselves of the essential truths which this doctrine seeks to safeguard, and even to be ready to consider any more adequate terminology which may have become available. This is the task which Professor Cyril C. RICHARDSON undertakes in his book, *The Doctrine of the Trinity*: A Clarification of What it Attempts to Express.[1] Clearly and trenchantly he exposes the frailty of orthodox phraseology, and tentatively makes suggestions which he feels are less unsatisfactory.

The author recognizes that the declarations of faith and experience in the New Testament make some Trinitarian affirmation about God almost inevitable. He is able to show, however, that the terms 'Father' and 'Son' though full of meaning in reference to the incarnate life of Christ, cease to be suitable when used with the purpose of expressing an eternal relationship within the Godhead. However one may try to overcome the natural implication that the Father is prior to the Son by speaking of the eternal generation of the Son, the very word 'Son' does in fact give the impression that the 'first term of the Trinity is really more God than the second.' Similarly to declare that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son clearly suggests a certain inferiority in the Spirit. Professor RICHARDSON also protests that the word 'Person' is suitable to apply only to God Himself, and not to Father, Son and Spirit separately. He prefers in this context to speak of 'modes of being.' He argues also that a binitarian formula would have been logically less open to objection than a trinitarian one. He claims: 'The Spirit and the Word are two ways of saying the same thing—that over against God's transcendent majesty, he comes to us, revealing, inspiring and re-creating.' 'The "threeness" of the Trinity is an arbitrary and unpersuasive doctrine.' Professor RICHARDSON certainly provides a searching analysis of the difficulties inherent in the orthodox phrasing of the Trinitarian formula, and discusses carefully many of the important expositions of the Trinity, contained both in older, standard works, and also in more recent ones by Barth, Hodgson and Dorothy Sayers.

His own suggestion for an improved formula seems to lie in a frank recognition of a fundamental and final paradox in the nature of God, without any attempt to resolve it. Time and again he returns to these mutually irreconcilable truths: 'God is absolutely transcendent, inaccessible and infinitely above his creation; yet, too, he is related to it.' 'He who is pure joy appropriates the pain born of sin. He who is infinitely removed from creation is the one who creates. He who knows no sin bears the pain of sin.' One wonders, however, whether the problem in this stark paradox is

[1] Abingdon Press; $3.00.

indeed set by the nature of God or by the imperfection of the human mind. Is it wise to try to reconcile in one form of words the philosophic concept of God as necessarily 'Absolute' and that approach of deep devotion which characterized our Lord's own faith in God as 'Abba, Father'? To insist that God must be 'Absolute' may be a mark of our ignorance rather than of our wisdom. Christian theology does well to base itself on the New Testament rather than on supposedly logical deductions from assumed premises.

One of the later chapters deals with the Trinity of Revelation (or, as some prefer to call it, the Trinity of Experience). This interpretation of the doctrine finds in it a convenient way of insisting on three necessary ways of thinking about God, (1) as the ultimate source of all being and life, (2) as the self-revealing One known in Christ, and (3) as the self-imparting One who came as the Holy Spirit. This exposition of the doctrine is exposed to the charge of 'Sabellianism,' since it may suggest that the three Persons of the Trinity are merely three 'rôles' which the one God assumes. This criticism may be avoided however if it is acknowledged that the 'threefold revelation bespeaks eternal distinctions, though we can never penetrate them.' The author offers a further criticism, however. If the Trinity represents merely ways in which God is made known to us, there is no reason why such ways may not number thirty rather than three. He insists further that the doctrine of the Trinity purposes to declare what is true about God in His being, and not merely what we may know about Him in our experience. The author's own final summary, however, does not seem clearly distinguishable from the Trinity of Revelation. He writes: 'We are confronted in the New Testament with three dominant symbols of God. These we can and should use to express deep Christian concern.' 'But,' he adds, 'we should avoid supposing they do not overlap or that they imply three distinct persons in the Trinity.'

The book therefore sharply reminds us that the accepted doctrine is not perfectly satisfactory as a logically consistent statement of philosophic truth, although it has been a successful means of preserving the religious insights about God which the New Testament discloses to us. Since, however, our thought of God as Trinity comes through the *revelation* of the New Testament, is it a serious error to see in the doctrine primarily a Trinity of *Revelation*? May it not be wise for us to make no pretence of knowing God as He is in Himself, and rejoice rather in such knowledge of Him as He has made available to us? May we not be content to say humbly that the doctrine of the Trinity has proved to be the way in which poor human words have least inadequately co-ordinated and expounded those truths about God which have been disclosed to us in the writings of the New Testament? The words of the New Testament about God's nature and His approach to us we accept with grateful confidence as truth on which we may rely. The formalized doctrine of the Trinity we accept 'because we know none better.'

Once in a famous phrase G. K. Chesterton prayed that we should be delivered

> From all the easy speeches
> That comfort cruel men.

Never was there a book with fewer 'easy speeches' in it than *The Ministry of the Word*, by Mr. R. E. C. Browne.[1] It is a salutary experience to read a book in which sentence after sentence has to be read twice before the meaning is grasped, and paragraphs have to be restudied before the connexion and the development of thought appear. This is a book which a man must 'gird up the loins of his mind' to read, but, let it be said at once, it amply and richly repays the effort.

From one point of view it would be possible to say that there is in this book a kind of horror of certainty; but it would be far truer to say that in it there is a deep appreciation of mystery. 'It would be easy to talk smoothly of God if he were not both immanent and transcendent, omnipotent and merciful, infinitely strong and infinitely compassionate, omnipresent yet caring for each person in each place with unfailing wisdom, patience and love. It would be easy to talk smoothly and competently if it could be stated exactly what the Incarnation and the Atonement mean. A preacher could more easily be fluent if he had not to keep in mind the threefold nature of man; that man is a creature, finite, limited in knowledge and power; that he is made in the image of God and so capable of relationship with God; that he is a sinner and so capable of the most hideous stupidity and cruelty when he sets out to be all-powerful or sinks down to being sub-human.' For that very reason the authority of the preacher will lie not in cut-and-dried statements but 'in his leaving only partly described what can only be partly described, no matter how disappointed or distressed his hearers may be. Every authentic proclamation of the gospel has always a definite indefiniteness about

[1] S.C.M. ['Studies in Ministry and Worship' series]; 8s. 6d.

it.' To be mature as a theologian is ' to be dogmatic where it is right to be dogmatic and agnostic where it is proper to be agnostic.' Paley's advice to young preachers ' to be neither too vague nor too exact ' is sound.

From this certain things follow. ' Fear of error is the greatest enemy of truth. . . . Ministers of the Word sometimes encourage one another to dread error rather than to reverence truth.' Long ago G. K. Chesterton said that an orthodox theologian was like a man walking along a narrow ridge of rock with an abyss of heresy on either side. Mr. BROWNE has it that ' we can only think our clearest thoughts and speak our most authoritative words from the fringes of error ; for example, our clearest statements of the omnipotence of God almost deny the freedom of man.' As Mr. BROWNE says, it is profoundly true that ' a truth is often capable of being most clearly seen when it is about to be denied.' It is by considering the power of God's grace that we begin to understand the nature of the human effort required in man's salvation. ' The importance of the ministry is most clearly seen when one is at the point of denying it ; the significance of the Church's corporate life can best be seen at the point where one is about to deny it in emphasizing the value of the individual ; the value of each individual is most clearly seen when one is about to deny it in affirming the value of the corporate.' But it must be clearly remembered that in this book there is no dancing on dialectical and paradoxical tight-ropes, for, as Mr. BROWNE finely says, ' Meditation is not part of a process that ends in a finished conclusion, it is the prelude to adoration of the mystery that is God.'

If there is much of this book which is difficult—although rewarding—reading, there is one chapter which is crystal clear and of the greatest practical importance ; that is the chapter entitled ' Modern Apologetics.' Mr. BROWNE rightly believes that in modern apologetics the ' consideration of theism must often precede consideration of christology and attention must often be given to the implications of the doctrine of creation before presenting the doctrine of redemption.' Creation must be represented as a continuous activity and as the creation of all things, wherever this may lead. The Christian apologist must not stop. ' He must recognize the divine operation manifest in the work of artists, Christian and non-Christian, in the prayers of the devout, in the construction of aircraft and high explosives, for without God nothing is made that is made. . . . It must be admitted that the concentration of the forger and the perseverance of the man of prayer both depend on the divinely created energy.'

It may well be that the work of the apologist will be to destroy the illusions ' by which men protect themselves from the harshness of too much knowledge, and the destruction of their illusions seems to them as death.'

The apologist will often work through influence. Influence must come through a personal relationship, but, as Mr. BROWNE wisely and penetratingly and warningly says, ' True influence can only come as a result of a relationship, and only where the relationship is not desired *in order to exert influence*.' Such relationships are ' more likely to be furthered by an interested listener than by an engaging talker, especially if he is bent on using every opportunity to be improving.'

Whenever the apologist has to deal with those who do not practise religion, he should always assume that they have some serious reason for not practising it. One of the duties of the apologist is to help the other man to see *why* he does not practise religion. The apologist has a duty to show a man what is involved in being a conscientious atheist, agnostic, or communist. If a man is to be converted, he must be quite clear from what he has been converted. If he must continue to oppose the Church, he must be helped to oppose it for the right reasons. In any event, the Church will be helped far more by intelligent opposition than by deadening apathy. Still further, it is better for a man's soul to oppose the truth, and to know that he is doing so, than to ignore the truth. And, finally, when a man has been led to see his own position clearly, and to realize the axioms on which he does in fact base his life, he may well be more open to the mysterious activity of the grace of God ' which none can command but to which all must submit.' We have seldom seen a statement of apologetic aims which has a nobler respect for the rights of human personality.

Few preachers will lay down this book without an unhappy feeling of the cheapness of their own preaching ; but, equally, few preachers will lay it down without a new sense of the mystery and the splendour of the gospel which they preach. This will inevitably never be one of the popular books on preaching ; it makes too many mental and spiritual demands on the reader for that, but it will remain one of the great books on preaching.

Christian Doctrine and its Communication[1]

By the Very Reverend F. W. Dillistone, D.D., Dean of Liverpool

In his recent book *The Communication of the Christian Faith* Dr. Kraemer shows that in every discussion of communication there are two aspects to be considered. There is 'communication of' and 'communication between.' There is, in other words, a message, a gospel, a doctrine, a system of theology; there is also a channel, a relationship, a language-system, a network of inter-relatedness, a community. In simplest terms there is the thing to be communicated, there is the community in which communication is to take place. Without active communication there cannot be healthy community: without living community there cannot be efficient communication. This inter-relationship is, I believe, of supreme importance. Language and community, the word and the social unit, the gospel and the Church, can never be separated in experience and although at any one time the initiative may lie with one member of the dialectic the complete dominance of one or the other can only lead to lopsidedness and final distortion.

How then is this two-way relationship to be established and sustained? Only, it seems to me, by a constant concern with the problem of language-forms on the one hand and with problems of social structure on the other. A doctrine of the Word which is unrelated to competent and well-informed studies of communication soon loses its cutting edge: a doctrine of the Church which is unrelated to the careful investigations of social scientists soon loses contact with the real world in which communications have to be made. This to me is the fundamental difficulty of Barth's theology—that while it allows the necessity of a proper knowledge of ancient languages it tries to be independent of all the problems connected with meaning and interpretation in present-day philosophical and psychological studies. Similarly, such a book as *The Apostolic Ministry*, while full of historical learning and knowledge of early patterns of Christian society, seems unwilling to ask how far these have any relation to the social forms which have come into existence within our modern technological civilization. Doctrine which expresses itself only through a given form of words and a rigid pattern of society has little chance of communicating itself into the new world of the mid-twentieth century.

For example, whereas up until even as recently as twenty years ago Christian doctrine had to be communicated within an environment whose dominant characteristics were struggles for the ideal political society and for the authentic historical word, to-day we have been plunged into a situation where the great struggles are those for any kind of spiritual values in an inexorable materialistic process and for any kind of determinative word in a universe where historical events have ceased to bear meaning. It cannot, I think, be too often emphasized how different is our situation to-day from what it was in 1900. Then it was still possible for the Christian to speak to the world around him about *natural* theology—about orderly structures in Nature and their theological significance, about laws operating in the universe and their importance for the life of society, about analogies linking creation and incarnation and recreation: it was still possible to speak about revelation in and through *history*—about a Divine providence in human history, about particular events bearing altogether exceptional significance, about a unique ingression into history which could be viewed within its historical perspective and found to contain the word of interpretation for all history. I do not say that it is impossible to speak in those terms any longer but I do say that it is extremely difficult to win a hearing for any such forms of language. The general view of nature and society current in 1900 no longer makes sense to the vast majority of our contemporaries: the sense of history, of the importance of events in the far distant past, no longer makes any appeal to the world at large to-day. Laws and continuities whether in nature or society are regarded as highly questionable: the era of minute investigations of what actually happened at former periods of world history is, I think, virtually at an end. Relativity and statistical probability are key-words in the general world of science: the search for importance and the understanding of psychological motivations are increasingly necessary in the general world of history.

Nor is this just a matter of a small avant-garde or of the experts in academic circles. Everywhere man has leapt forward into a new conviction that somehow he is in potential control of the natural order. It is no longer a case of adjusting himself and his works to a given order of Nature, to unchangeable laws which govern both his world and his own social development, but rather of going ahead and gaining an increasing mastery over the

[1] This article contains the substance of an address given at the Conference of Principals of Anglican Theological Colleges, held in Birmingham in December 1957.

forces which may be harnessed to his own designs. There may still be a good deal of lip-service to an omnipotent Creator and Preserver but so far as his plans and activities are concerned man believes that he can bring about a constant improvement in the material and social well-being of humanity if he is allowed to apply the knowledge which he has in an empirical way. It is true that we are at present confronted by the great division between East and West—the East wishing to push ahead its plans for material advancement by means of a centralized and totalitarian control of all available resources, the West wishing still to keep open the channels of free competition and consenting co-operation. But there is little disagreement on the fundamental thesis that man has it in his own power to harness the forces of Nature to his own advantage. For better, for worse, we live in an era of amazing technological achievement and no theology which cannot relate itself to an empirical view of life and to the unquestioning confidence in the technological skill of scientific man can expect to gain a hearing to-day. It may need to relate itself through criticism, even through refutation, but the point is that unless it speaks into the real situation by means of appropriate images and language forms its voice will be regarded as an echo of an outdated era which has no reference to the world in which we live.

But at the very same time that man has leapt forward to this recognition of his own powers, he has largely lost interest in the era which could be called the pre-technological era. Such a revolution has taken place in his ways of living over the past fifty years that A.D. 1900 seems almost as remote as 1900 B.C. How can historical events from within the pre-scientific era have any continuing effect on life as it has to be lived to-day? how can any significant guidance for decisions which have to be made in the economic complexities of the industrial age be derived from an agrarian or free trade economy of an earlier time? So for better, for worse, we live in an era where time has been narrowed down to the limits of the day, the hour, the moment—no longer the millennium, the century, the year—and no theology which cannot relate itself to the psychological conflicts and existential decisions of man in the present can expect to gain a hearing. Again it may need to relate itself through penetrating analysis and rigorous criticism but unless its concern is with this kind of situation its labour to-day, so far as I can judge, is largely in vain.

If there is any validity in what I have so far been saying what does it all imply for the theological curriculum of our colleges? It implies that very different forms of communication need to be learned in 1957 compared with, shall we say, 1927 I do not for a moment mean that we can dispense with the struggles for the Church as the given society, as the society extending the Incarnation within humanity; or for the gospel as the authentic word of God spoken into history, as the word which has revolutionized the total historical situation. But I do say that there needs to be a different emphasis to-day, a re-orientation, a struggle on a new front. As the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says in a memorable passage we are not called to lay certain fundamental structures over and over again: any refinements in our knowledge of the literary analysis of the Bible, of the liturgical development of the Church's life, of the transmission of oral forms and written texts, of the Church's relations with Greek philosophy and Roman law, of the conflicts between the Church and the secular power, all these can be safely left to the expert. It is surely enough for the majority of theological students to be made aware of a generally accepted framework of knowledge regarding these issues and particularly of the important books from which reliable information can be gained. But let the minimum of time be devoted to these matters in order that students may receive all the preparation that it is possible to give them for their struggles with the contemporary world into which they will so soon be plunged.

I do not think that the most urgent task will be that of relating themselves to developments in the world of the *natural* sciences. The more equipped a man is to read and speak intelligently about the structures of the physical universe in which we live and move and have our being and which must surely be related to the purpose of God in Christ, the better. Books by writers such as Mascall, Smethurst, Thornton, Coulson and Milne can be of great service in this respect. But the more pressing matter in my judgment is the rapid development in the field of the *social* sciences and the way in which social patterns are changing almost over-night by means of the new forces which are operative in this technological age. It is disastrous to imagine that forms of social organization to which the Church sought to relate itself in the sixteenth, or even the nineteenth century are of any real significance to-day. The areas of flexibility grow smaller and smaller in a world where economic and technical considerations are paramount.

What then does this mean in more concrete terms? It means, it seems to me, at least two things. First of all the focus of interest both in Biblical history and in Church history should be transferred from the ascertaining of actual information about sources and events to the understanding of social patterns as expressed in symbols

and language, in codes of ethical behaviour and in ritual forms. What we need to know is how the particular dynamic which inspired Israel in its developing social life differed from and yet was related to the social dynamics of the peoples with whom Israel was brought into contact in its progress through history. Similarly we need to know how the Christian Church at successive stages of its history related itself to the structures of society within which its own particular life was being lived. Is not this the secret of such books as Pedersen's *Israel*, Cochrane's *Christianity and Classical Culture*, Gilson on the Middle Ages, Troeltsch on the Reformation Period, Niebuhr on the contemporary world, that each and all are seeking to see the people of God as the Divine society in the midst of a secular society and are asking how the two are related in law, in culture, in economics, in family life? It is, above all, the principles and illustrations of relationship that we need to understand if the Christian Church is to relate itself significantly to the Welfare State in England, or to the Communist regime in China, or to the freer competitive society of the U.S.A.

Whether it is desirable that some of the works of social scientists themselves should be tackled during the ordinary College course I am not prepared to say. But sooner or later, any minister of religion should surely pay attention to the methods of the Welfare Services, and should seek to see how his own particular function in society is related to theirs. I cannot feel that we as Christians have yet taken seriously enough the work of the social anthropologists and historians of culture who have, by their patient labours, put so much information at our disposal. How vastly more important is, shall we say, Richard Hoggart's *The Uses of Literacy* than so many of the books on the Church normally prescribed in a regular theological course.

Turning to the theology of the Word, I cannot believe that much is to be gained by holding tenaciously to the Reformation ideal of knowing the Scriptures in the original tongues in which they were written or to the ideal of the Catholic tradition in Christendom of knowing the languages in which the Early Fathers expressed their teachings. There will, of course, always be a place in the Church for the man well versed in Hebrew or Greek or Latin—and indeed in Syriac and Aramaic and other ancient languages—but for the ordinary man who shows no promise of special ability in this field I must believe that his time would be better spent in learning the principles and practices of communication for to-day than in attempting to gain a smattering of the medium of communication of a past age. Good translations are now easily available but what we need to know is how words belonging to one tradition or culture are to be made meaningful to another.

Here, again, I cannot feel that we as Christians have taken seriously enough the work of the semanticists and historians of symbolic forms who have done so much to illuminate the processes by which men communicate with one another. What is the function of language? What are its principal forms? How can meaning be transferred from one linguistic context into another? How is language related to visual symbols and actions? These are urgent questions to the study of which any student could be introduced. And beyond that there is the most complex subject of the psychology of communication. How does a speaker win the right to be heard? What conditions are most conducive to sympathetic reception? What are the dangers to be avoided? And, finally, there is the remarkable modern phenomenon of increased interest in the drama. How can drama be used in Christian communication? What is the significance of the influence of existentialism in the modern drama? Can the Christian gospel be expressed in existentialist terms? Such questions can hardly be asked without the name of Bultmann coming to mind and it may not be without significance that within the last few weeks a recently ordained man said to me that he wished he might have spent a whole term in his theological College wrestling with Bultmann's ideas rather than learning in a rather conventional way certain of the basic requirements of the traditional course.

To sum up. I recognize fully that no sudden and radical change can be made in the teaching of the Bible, Church History and Doctrine. But I think that it would not be impossible for a certain change of emphasis or a certain re-orientation to come about in the communication of Christian Theology. Could we move away from too great a concentration upon the teaching of the Church on man and his world as conceived in the pre-scientific era over to a Christian Doctrine of Nature and Society which can be related to the ongoing studies of the natural and social scientists of our own day? From too great a concentration upon redemption as a historical phenomenon expressible within the categories of historic theology over to a Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation which can be related to the exposures and analyses found in the existential and psychological cultural forms of our time? I do not despise either substance philosophy or a moral interpretation of history: I only suggest that for effective communication to-day we need the language of empirical science and of psychological subjectivity if we are to make contact with the world as it is and not as we might like it to be.

Paul's Certainties

III. What God Requires of Man—Romans xiv. 14

By the Reverend Owen E. Evans, M.A., B.D., Hartley Victoria College, Manchester

'I know, and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself: save that to him who accounteth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean.'—Ro 14^{14} (R.V.).

The purpose of this article is *first*, to consider the nature of the situation with which Paul is concerned in the chapter as a whole, and the way in which he deals with that situation; and *secondly*, to consider the bearing on Paul's argument of the strong affirmation which he makes in *v.* 14.

I

It is an open question whether Paul is dealing, in this chapter, with a specific situation that existed in the Church at Rome, or with the question of religious scruples in general. The older commentators seem unanimously to have taken it for granted that he had in mind a definite sect or body in the Roman Church, characterized by abstention from meat (*vv.* 2, 21) and wine (*v.* 21), and by the esteeming of 'one day above another' (*v.* 5).[1] Among recent commentators, A. Nygren [2] and C. K. Barrett [3] favour this view. The difficulty that such an interpretation has always had to face is that of accounting for a single group of persons in which were combined the three particular scruples mentioned in the chapter. That a group of Jewish Christians is meant is unlikely, since neither abstention from wine nor an absolute abstention from meat was a Jewish practice. Nor does the view that the Roman ascetics were of pagan origin, influenced by the practices of the Pythagorean and other heathen sects, fit all the facts, for whilst such sects abstained from meat and wine, there is no evidence that they scrupulously observed certain days. Less objection applies to the theory, supported by F. J. A. Hort [4] and J. Denney,[5] that the sect was influenced by Essenism, which was ascetic in tendency and, being Jewish, observed days. C. K. Barrett finds the closest parallel in the heretics of Colossae, who 'gave special veneration to certain days (Col 2^{16}), and practised various kinds of abstinence (Col $2^{16.\ 21f.}$); it is probable that they arose out of some kind of fusion between Judaism and gnosticism.' 'It may be,' he adds, 'that some such fusion had occurred in Rome, though the "weak" in Rome were much more Christian (and much less gnostic) than the heretics of Colossae.' [6] If it is necessary to identify a definite sect at Rome, Barrett's solution is as satisfactory as any. Sanday and Headlam, however, argue for the alternative interpretation, that 'St. Paul writes throughout with the remembrance of his own former experience, and not with a view to special difficulties in the Roman community. He writes on all these vexed questions, not because they have arisen there, but because they may arise.' [7] In favour of this interpretation, it is at least arguable that there is no absolute necessity to identify the 'he that regardeth the day' of *v.* 6 with the 'he that eateth' of the same verse. Paul may simply be giving different illustrations of the kind of scrupulosity he has in mind. C. H. Dodd is content to leave the question open: 'Whether these were actually burning questions at Rome we do not know. It is likely enough. At any rate, these were the kind of questions that were bound to crop up.' [8] And it is indeed fortunate that the permanent value of the teaching which Paul gives in this chapter is unaffected by the answer that one gives to the particular question as to whether there actually existed in Rome a sect of vegetarians who were also total abstainers and sabbatarians.

Whether he is dealing with an actual dispute between two parties in the Roman Church, or with a dispute that might arise at any time, within the Christian community, on any such issue as eating or drinking or the observance of days, Paul envisages two distinct types of Christian, which he designates respectively as 'the strong' (οἱ δυνατοί, 15^{1}) and 'the weak' (ὁ ἀσθενῶν, 14^{1-2}; cf. τῶν ἀδυνάτων, 15^{1}). The distinction is between the Christian who has, and the Christian who has not fully grasped the implications of that doctrine of salvation by faith which, in the earlier chapters of the Epistle, Paul has expounded so fully as the basis of the Christian life. The 'weak in faith' (*v.* 1) is the man 'who does not understand that salvation is of faith from first to last, and that

[1] See Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, [*I.C.C.*], 399 ff.
[2] *Commentary on Romans* [1952], 441 f.
[3] *The Epistle to the Romans* [1957], 257 f.
[4] Quoted in Sanday and Headlam, *op. cit.*, 401.
[5] *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ii. 700 b.
[6] *Op. cit.*, 257 f.
[7] *Op. cit.*, 401.
[8] *Moffatt Commentary on Romans*, 212.

faith is secured by its own entireness and intensity, not by a timorous scrupulosity of conscience' (Denney, *ad loc.*); consequently he still feels obliged to observe such scruples in regard to food and drink and observance of days as marked his pre-Christian practice. The 'strong', on the other hand, realizing that such practices are matters of indifference to the Christian (cf. *v.* 17), 'believes he may eat anything' (*v.* 2 [R.S.V.]), and 'esteems all days alike' (*v.* 5). It seems clear that Paul regards the attitude of the strong as being that which is normal in the Church. He assumes that in any dispute that has arisen or may arise, the strong will be in the majority and will constitute the governing element; accordingly he appeals to this group to 'welcome' the weak (14^1), and to bear with their weaknesses (15^1). It is equally clear that Paul includes himself among the strong; this is implied in the affirmation of *v.* 14, the principle expressed in *v.* 17, and the pronoun 'we' in 15^1.

In the first half of the chapter, Paul is concerned with the attitude of each group toward the other (*vv.* 1–12). The strong are to welcome the weak as fellow-members of the Christian fellowship, and that not simply in order to discuss their scruples with them in an endeavour to persuade them to abandon such scruples ('not for disputes over opinions,' *v.* 1 [R.S.V.]), but in a spirit of sympathetic forbearance, without taking a superior attitude towards them or despising them in any way (*v.* 3). Here Paul is warning the strong against what would be a natural tendency on their part. He does not forget, however, to warn the weak against what would be an equally natural tendency for them, and an equally wrong attitude, namely a censorious criticism of those who do not share their scruples. They are not to 'pass judgment on' the strong; they are to remember that 'God has welcomed' the latter, and that it is not meet for them to interfere with God's judgment by setting themselves up as judges (*vv.* 3–4). Every individual Christian must 'be fully convinced in his own mind' concerning such matters as eating meat and observing days, and must act in accordance with his convictions, seeking only to honour his Lord by utter obedience to the Divine will as he understands it. If his motive is to please God, whatever he does in these matters will prove acceptable with God (*vv.* 5–6). Paul enforces this point by the reminder that Christ, by virtue of His death and resurrection, is the Christian's Lord both in life and in death, so that no Christian either lives or dies to himself (*vv.* 7–9). This first half of the chapter closes with a further appeal to each party to resist its besetting temptation (*v.* 10, cf. *v.* 3), the appeal being made the more effective by the reminders that they are brothers to each other, and that the time and place for judgment, for all alike, will be when they 'stand before the judgment seat of God' to give account of themselves to Him who is the only rightful Judge of men (*vv.* 10–12).

After a further general appeal to both parties no longer to pass judgment on one another (*v.* 13a), Paul proceeds in the second half of the chapter to address himself to the strong. He has required from both parties alike that they display an attitude of toleration towards those who think differently from themselves. There is, however, a further requirement which he feels bound to make of the one party; it is that they let their conduct be determined by a sympathetic consideration of the effect it will have upon others. This is a principle that applies to the strong in a way it cannot apply to the weak. There is no danger that the weak, by observing their scruples, would in any way injure the strong; there is, on the other hand, a real danger that the strong, by exercising what they regard as their legitimate freedom, would cause grievous harm to the weak. The strong do not consider the conduct of the weak, in regard to their scruples, to be wrong, but merely unnecessary; the weak, however, consider the conduct of the strong in these matters to be sinful. For a sensitive Christian, to see his fellow-Christian committing what he regards as a sin is a matter of grief. The strong should avoid causing such grief to their weaker brethren; nothing less than that is required by the supreme Christian commandment of love which Paul has enunciated in 12^{10} and 13^{8-10}. This is the point of *v.* 15a, and in the second half of the same verse Paul goes further, pointing out that the action of the strong may not merely cause grief to the weak but actually bring about his ruin, by inducing him, in defiance of his own conscience, to follow the example set by the strong and so to commit what, in his case, would be sin. Why it would be sinful for the weak to eat meat, in defiance of his own conscientious scruples, Paul explains in *v.* 23; his action would not be based (as is that of the strong, *v.* 2) upon faith, and 'whatsoever is not of faith'—*i.e.*, any action that is inconsistent with the Christian's right attitude towards God, which is an attitude of trustful dependence and utter obedience to what he believes to be God's will—'is sin.' The weak, if he commits such sin, will of course be held responsible ('condemned,' *v.* 23) for it. But the strong, inasmuch as his action induced the weak to commit the sin, will also bear a share of the responsibility.

Paul readily agrees that, for the strong, the eating of meat or the drinking of wine is in itself permissible, since 'nothing is unclean in itself' (*v.* 14)—a principle for which he might have

claimed the authority of Jesus' own words in Mk 7^{15-19}—and since rules about eating and drinking form no part of the requirements of a life lived under the sovereign rule of God (which is what the term 'kingdom of God' means in *v.* 17). At the same time, however, Paul insists that what is not permissible, for the strong or for any other Christian, is to behave in such a way as to injure a fellow-Christian, since it ill becomes any one who professes to serve Christ to contribute to the ruin of one whom Christ Himself died to save (*v.* 15); so to act is to transgress the supreme commandment of love. In such circumstances, conduct which in itself is good becomes evil (*vv.* 16, 20b), and the right thing is to abstain from it (*v.* 21). Such abstinence on the part of the strong involves no sacrifice of principle, but merely the sacrifice of personal liberty, privilege and pleasure; and such a sacrifice is one that Christian love demands. To refuse to make it is to fail in one's duty, not only to individual fellow-Christians, but also to the Church as a corporate fellowship, for it involves a neglect of 'things which make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another,' with a consequent destruction of 'the work of God' (*vv.* 19–20a). It cannot ever be right to do such a thing, much less for the mere sake of one's own personal gratification in such an unimportant matter (cf. *v.* 17) as the food one eats.

Accordingly, Paul feels justified in appealing to the strong (*v.* 13b) to come to a definite decision (κρίνατε) 'never to put a stumbling-block or hindrance in the way of a brother.' He does not mean that they are to go back on their convictions about such matters as eating and drinking, as a matter of principle (to do that, indeed, would be, for them, an action not based on faith, and so, on the principle laid down in *v.* 23, sinful). They may continue to cherish their convictions, for it is a happy thing to have no reason to judge oneself in that which one's conscience approves (*v.* 22b). But they are not to flaunt their stronger faith before their weaker brethren; rather are they to keep it between themselves and God (*v.* 22a). They know themselves that they possess this faith, and they may be assured that God knows too; whether or not their weaker brethren know is not of moment. What does matter, as far as the weaker brethren are concerned, is that they should not see the strong ignoring, in practice, the scruples which they themselves hold dear. The strong, then, whilst continuing to cherish their convictions and to enjoy the blessedness which that involves, are to adapt themselves, in practice, to the scruples of the weak, for the latter's sake. They will be none the worse for this voluntary limitation of their own liberty; by not eating and drinking certain foods and beverages they will not be withholding from God any service that He requires, for 'the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost' (*v.* 17). And being still able, in spite of their voluntary abstinence from meat and wine, to serve Christ in these things that really matter, they will be 'well-pleasing to God, and approved of men' (*v.* 18).

Before leaving this reconstruction of the argument of ch. 14 as a whole, it may be added that in the opening verses of the following chapter, in reaffirming the duty of the strong to bear with the infirmities of the weak, rather than seek the gratification of their own personal desires, and so to suit their behaviour to the purpose of helping and edifying the weak, Paul produces what is undoubtedly the supreme reason why they should take this course. He appeals to the example of the Master Himself: 'for Christ also pleased not himself' (15^{3}). 'The verb sums up the work and character of Christ throughout his earthly life . . . in one word he gives an admirable summary of the impression conveyed by the Gospels' (Barrett, *ad loc.*). In 14^{15} Paul emphasized the overriding importance, for the determination of Christian conduct, of the principle of 'walking in love.' Now he brings before his readers the Perfect Example of a life governed by that principle.

> It is the way the Master went;
> Should not the servant tread it still?

II

It remains briefly to consider, against the background of the foregoing exposition of ch. 14 as a whole, the importance for Paul's argument of the 'certainty' to which he gives expression in *v.* 14. It may seem that some apology is due to the reader for the long delay in arriving at the actual 'text' of the article! The writer can only plead that the 'terms of reference' for the present series was to interpret the text 'along with the whole context in which it occurs'; and that the full significance of this particular Pauline 'certainty' can, in any case, only be appreciated in the light of the whole chapter, or at any rate of the second half of the chapter, which has occupied the greater part of the discussion.

It is often assumed that the substance of Paul's confident affirmation in this case—the truth of which he says 'I know, and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus'—is simply that which is contained in the immediate object clause, 'that nothing is unclean of itself.' If this is so, the second half of the verse must be understood as a qualification which he admits to the truth he has just affirmed in such confident tones. It is as if Paul were declaring a

truth of which he is certain, and then immediately admitting that a different view is possible. This would be a strange procedure, and one that is not paralleled in the other declarations of certainty which are the subject of this series of articles. The more natural interpretation, therefore, is to understand, as the object of 'I know, and am persuaded,' the whole of the rest of the verse. The clause introduced by εἰ μή is an exceptive clause, dependent upon the statement 'nothing is unclean of itself,' and should be translated 'except that . . .', as in Mk 6^5.[1] This would seem preferable to the procedure, followed in some English translations (including A.V. and R.S.V.), of placing a period after 'itself' and translating εἰ μή by 'but,' as if a new statement were being introduced. Moreover, the inclusion, in the ὅτι clause, of the phrase 'in itself' prepares the way for the exceptive clause, and indeed requires it to complete the statement which Paul is so confidently making.

We conclude, therefore, that what Paul is so certain of is not just that nothing is unclean in itself, but also that certain foods are unclean to those who conscientiously think them so. Such is the fundamental conviction[2] which prompts him to issue to the strong Christians the special appeal which is contained in the second half of the chapter. In the light of this conviction we are enabled to see why Paul regards it as a matter of such vital importance that the strong should bear with the infirmities of the weak and limit, for their sake, the exercise of their own liberty in the matter of eating and drinking. Paul is convinced that a danger of the most real and serious nature is involved for the weak—the danger, not merely of their having to suffer the grief of 'hurt feelings' (*v.* 15a), but of their becoming actually involved in sin (*v.* 23), which may lead to their ruin (*v.* 15b). For any Christian to expose his fellow-Christian to such danger is a most serious matter; indeed, in 1 Co 8^{12} (in the well-known passage where he makes essentially the same appeal to the strong Christians at Corinth, with reference to the specific issue of eating food that has been sacrificed to idols), Paul goes so far as to describe it as a 'sin against Christ.'

Thus the substance of Paul's 'certainty,' translated into general terms, is that certain actions which, considered objectively, are by no means sinful nevertheless become sinful when they are performed with a bad conscience. The sin consists, not in the performing of the action as such, but in the withholding from God of the obedience which one conscientiously believes Him to require. What God requires of man is loving obedience, and such obedience necessarily involves refraining from any action which one's own conscience tells one is contrary to God's will (whether or not the action, considered objectively, is actually contrary to God's will). What Paul requires of the strong Christian, in this chapter, is that he should do nothing, however legitimate in itself, that would hinder his weaker brother from rendering the required obedience to God. And this requirement of Paul's, as he himself indeed claims, is surely no other than the requirement of that golden rule of love which ultimately must govern the Christian's every action.

[1] Cf. also Gal 1^7, and E. D. Burton's note thereon (*Galatians* [*I.C.C.*], 22). Burton mentions Ro 14^{14} along with Gal 1^7 and Mk 6^5 as instances of εἰ μή meaning 'except that.'

[2] It is a conviction which, as he claims, he holds 'in the Lord Jesus'; *i.e.*, it is 'a natural deduction from his faith and life in Christ' (Sanday and Headlam, *ad loc.*).

Literature

FAITH AND FREEDOM

It may well be that the chief question for Christian theology in the coming decades will be that of the right approach to the Bible; of the way we must understand and handle it in the twentieth century if it is to speak the Word of God to our condition. If so, we must indeed be grateful to Professor Leonard Hodgson; for right at the beginning of this second volume of Gifford Lectures—*For Faith and Freedom*, vol. ii.: *Christian Theology* (Blackwell; 25s. net)—he has fairly and squarely faced us with this problem. Even those who dislike his solution will surely be grateful for his raising of the problem, and many of us will be prepared to go much further with him, feeling that he has posed the question in the right form and that the solution he advocates is at least on the right general lines. He will have nothing to do with Biblicism; 'I publicly declare my hope,' he says, 'that no pupil of mine will ever be guilty of using the expression: "the Bible says. . . ."' The Biblical writers wrote in a world and thought-world quite different from ours, and that must always be allowed for in our handling of the Bible. The question we have to ask is always the same, though Dr. Hodgson has slightly different ways of phrasing it: '*What must the truth have been and be if men who thought and*

spoke as they did wrote of it like that?' It is not even simply a matter of our restating in our terms exactly what the Biblical writers said; sometimes, Professor Hodgson thinks, we have to say different, and greater, things. He is quite prepared to say that the categories to which the New Testament writers were limited were sometimes 'inadequate' for saying all that needs to be said, and he does not even shrink from admitting that our Lord Himself was limited by the terms of the Incarnation to categories which did not enable Him to know or claim the full truth about Himself. 'The developed doctrine is not simply concerned with what He thought of Himself while on earth, or what His disciples thought of Him, but with what He was' (p. 70). Professor Hodgson has said as much before, but it is good to have it fully and systematically set out. It is both the strength and the weakness of the book that the principles of this process of Biblical extrapolation—if we may call it so—are nowhere set out in a formal statement comparable to Bultmann's. Instead, Professor Hodgson devotes the later lectures to doing what Bultmann has so far refused to do, showing us the principles in action on an extended scale. Taking such subjects as God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Christian Church, prayer and eschatology, he first seeks to discover what light the Bible has to throw upon them, when it is interpreted according to his canons, and then to show that the understanding thus gained is fully consonant, to say the least, with the conclusions arrived at in his first series of lectures. Here again much of what he has to say he has said before, though the fact that he has discussed the Atonement so recently in his Hale Lectures has led him to exclude it from this book, a fact which needs to be borne in mind in assessing its balance and relative emphasis.

The extent to which the argument carries conviction will no doubt vary from reader to reader and chapter to chapter, but, as in the earlier series of lectures, Professor Hodgson's conclusions are often courageous and thought-provoking, notably perhaps in lectures 6 and 10 where he contends that 'Christ's revolution in the idea of messiahship involves a corresponding revolution in the idea of the messianic community,' a revolution which even now has not been fully carried through. If the New Testament writers thought that the end for which the Church exists is the salvation of its members, that, Professor Hodgson holds, was simply part of their heritage from late Jewish messianism. In fact the Church exists to join with Christ in His fight against evil and His service of every kind to humanity, and though it is through Christ that men come to the Father, it is not lightly to be assumed that their coming always does, or should, involve membership of the Church. 'This disentangles the question of Church membership from that of the hope of resurrection to life eternal' (p. 212) and it is for lack of such disentangling, according to Professor Hodgson, that we have had such unsatisfactory distinctions as that between the visible and the invisible Church. It is tempting to single out other individual arguments for mention, but three general comments must suffice.

Professor Hodgson clearly emerges from these lectures as one who can rest content with unresolved, and apparently unresolvable, antinomies at the very basis of his thought. (Examples can be found in his discussion of evil, of freedom and grace, or of God as 'both in Himself impassible and in relation to His creation passible.') This is of course not a new phenomenon in theology, but it is perhaps odd in one who strives so hard for intelligibility in the arguments he builds on the antinomies.

Secondly, the great frequency with which Professor Hodgson quotes his earlier—often much earlier—works may prompt a question. The span of his life-time has witnessed what many would regard as fundamental changes both in philosophy and in New Testament scholarship. Has Professor Hodgson taken the full measure of these changes and allowed them to influence his thinking enough? How will his philosophical style appeal to the linguistic analyst or his New Testament scholarship to the form-critic?

Which leads naturally to the third point. These lectures contain some tantalizing references to Bultmann. Professor Hodgson's programme is so similar to Bultmann's yet his conclusions so different from what one imagines Bultmann's would be, that it would be very worthwhile to have Professor Hodgson's—and, indeed, Bultmann's—observations on the subject. Will they not be provoked to a debate?

As an appendix—not very obviously relevant—Professor Hodgson reprints an article from 'The Journal of Theological Studies' in which he gives his reply to arguments that have been directed against his Croall Lectures on the doctrine of the Trinity.

D. E. Nineham

A STUDY IN ETHICAL THEORY

It is hardly possible to summarize Professor D. M. Mackinnon's book—*A Study in Ethical Theory* (A. and C. Black; 21s. net)—or even to say with any precision what it is about. To say this is not to detract from its value. Some of the greatest philosophical classics, including Plato's Republic, have the same characteristic. The texture of the discussion is complex and devious.

Certain major themes run through it, recurrently. Each is a living issue in contemporary thought. The opposition between an 'ethics of consequences' and an 'ethics of motive' is one of them. The question of the possibility of metaphysics is another. The distance between these two is bridged by a third, which concerns the character and the limits of our knowledge of the world. Sometimes one and sometimes another of these themes is uppermost, and their interweaving makes the book. Or perhaps it would be more meaningful to say that the book is concerned to reveal, from differing points of approach, how they are in fact interwoven in the concrete experience to which they refer.

A considerable part of the book consists of commentary upon the theories of historical moralists. The utilitarians—J. S. Mill and G. E. Moore in particular—Kant and Butler have whole chapters devoted to them; and elsewhere our attention is directed, often at considerable length, to the teaching of thinkers like Hegel or Prichard, Joseph or Collingwood, Russell or Ryle. But the treatment is not exposition or analysis or criticism in the usual sort. Rather the doctrines are taken as read and known, and we are invited to share a dialectical meditation upon their implications and their significances, particularly at the points where they impinge upon the everyday perplexities of action. So, we find no well-defined thesis maintained with the help of a battery of evidences and defended by a systematic destruction of objections. The procedure is dialectical, and the dialectic has some affinity with Kierkegaard's, if only in the absence of a synthesis. If we look for a conclusion, we can find only this: that questions that we had thought finally closed remain open; that too definite conclusions are to be avoided, because they have a way of proving dangerously one-sided; or, as Professor Mackinnon himself puts it, that 'there is a fluidity in philosophical insights, an openness of texture in their sense.'

Consider the treatment of agnosticism. Pure utilitarianism and pure Kantianism are antagonistic ethical doctrines; yet they meet in a common rejection of metaphysics. Both are forms of agnostic humanism. Yet these two agnosticisms have very different functions. The utilitarian expresses impatience with all that diverts interest and effort from the plain need to serve humanity. From this attitude there stems the aphorism that religion is the opium of the people. Kant's agnosticism, however, is a necessary defence of the autonomy of the will and so of moral freedom. But if we could *know* the unconditioned, the finality of moral obligation would disappear.

At this point another antithesis appears. It might seem that the utilitarian outlook at least guarantees political realism and effectiveness. We find that this is not so. On the other hand, we discover that 'to affirm the reality of the moral in the Kantian sense is to be committed to the taking of sides in the world of politics.' Yet this practical realism is grounded in an agnosticism which is incompatible with the reality of religion. For any knowledge of the Divine must ground morality in a surrender of the will, not in the assertion of its autonomy.

Professor Mackinnon's reflection upon this dialectic of ethics and religion, inconclusive as it must be, is specially arresting. But the whole work abounds in insights which deepen and vivify the wooden superficiality of so much ethical discussion. If its manner at times exasperates by an unnecessary preference for the devious thought and the tortuous expression, it is not inherently obscure. It will yield its secrets to the second reading which it certainly requires and richly deserves.

JOHN MACMURRAY

BIBLICAL EXEGESIS

Among current theological problems there is, perhaps, none more pressing than the problem of exegesis. Typology and demythologizing are the topics of a discussion not always based on responsible theological judgment, and sometimes degenerating into hot air. Into this debate Dr. R. M. Grant, in his book *The Letter and the Spirit* (S.P.C.K.; 15s. net), has injected a cold stream of pure scholarship, fascinating as a piece of academic research, and at the same time relevant to modern issues.

The main purpose of the book is to portray and discuss Origen's exegetical methods and the theory of inspiration on which they rest; but Dr. Grant (very properly) covers a good deal of ground before he reaches Origen. The first chapter deals with 'The Wisdom of the Ancients,' and examines beliefs held in antiquity about the inspiration of the poets, and allegorical and other methods of interpretation. Next comes a rather thin chapter, which sketches Philo's work as an exegete, and makes a few points, which one would have liked to see multiplied, about Josephus and the Rabbis. In the third chapter, Dr. Grant considers the idea of inspiration in the New Testament itself, and the New Testament use of the Old Testament. He moves on to the second century, dealing with heretical as well as orthodox writers, and so comes to Clement and Origen. Not content with a concluding chapter in which he puts together the results he has found and reflects on the problems of exegesis, Dr. Grant throws in three appendixes, in which he (*a*) rejects Dr. J. Knox's view of

Marcion's Gospel, (*b*) gives a most valuable review of Greek exegetical terminology (it is worth buying the book for this alone), and (*c*) adds some notes, based mainly on Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria, on textual and literary criticism.

The historical material in this book is set out with admirable clarity and accuracy. The conclusions to which Dr. Grant moves in his final discussion are admittedly tentative, but sound as far as they go. In the Bible, 'there is an indissoluble mixture of theology and history, a mixture which can be called "myth" until some better term is found. Each in his own way, the theologian and the historian, can try to do justice to this mixture. . . . Within the context of the Christian community, each will be trying to make intelligible the gospel which the Church proclaims' (p. 114).

The place where Dr. Grant is vulnerable is his treatment of the New Testament itself, where he has not allowed himself enough space to see and describe the facts in the round. The weakness, for example, of his discussion of the parables is that he views them simply as a literary phenomenon. Within these terms of reference what he says is well worth saying; but we have no hope of understanding the parables if we fail to view them in, and relate them at every point to, their context in the ministry of Jesus as a whole.

This review must not end with criticism but with renewed praise—and a warning. This is an excellent book; but it is not every man's book. It should be attempted only by those who are equipped and willing to do some hard scholarly work.

C. K. BARRETT

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

Professor R. K. Harrison, Ph.D., of Western Ontario, has published *A History of Old Testament Times* (Marshall, Morgan and Scott; 17s. 6d. net), which shows a good knowledge of Biblical archaeology and a wide acquaintance with modern scholarly work on the Old Testament. There are excellent chapters on Mesopotamia and Egypt, and in general the sketch of Israelite history in the setting of the world situation in which Israel lived is sound. The author is very conservative, and he appears to accept the historicity of the Book of Esther and of the stories in the first half of the Book of Daniel, though these are not so easy to relate to their supposed historical background. More surprising, however, is a certain inconsistency he shows in his own pages. Thus on p. 57 we are told that the patriarchal age fell roughly between 1700 and 1500 B.C., while just below we are told that Abraham's migration to Haran fell between 1925 and 1900 B.C., and on p. 64 that his migration to Canaan fell shortly after his father's death, which occurred a little before 1900 B.C. (Incidentally, the Book of Genesis says that this migration took place before the death of Terah.) On p. 85 we are told that Jacob's end fell during the early part of the Hyksos regime, which began about 1720 B.C. (p. 74). It would therefore appear that the author holds that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob all lived before the patriarchal age. On p. 74 we are told that the Hyksos ruled Egypt from *c.* 1720 to 1546 B.C., but on p. 86 that the Hyksos were finally driven from Egyptian soil about 1570 B.C. On p. 67 we learn that Sarah died in Hebron, but on p. 64 that Hebron was not founded until after the days of Abraham—about two hundred years, in fact, after his migration to Canaan. It would seem that the author wrote his book somewhat hastily.

Dr. Harrison holds that the mission of Ezra preceded that of Nehemiah (p. 216 ff.), but finds it necessary to make quite gratuitous accusations against Ezra, in order to do so. He thinks that when Ezra reached Jerusalem, instead of doing what he had been sent to do he began to build the walls of the city, attributing to him the abortive effort recorded in Ezr 4. There is no reason whatever to associate that story with Ezra, who is unmentioned in it. Dr. Harrison then assumes that Ezra incurred the royal displeasure and was recalled in 457 B.C. (p. 217). Again, there is no hint of this in the Bible. He next assumes that Nehemiah summoned Ezra to return to Jerusalem in 444 B.C. (p. 219). It is surely improbable that the authority of Nehemiah could override the royal displeasure.

Despite much that is excellent in this book, therefore, the reviewer would advise caution at a number of points.

H. H. ROWLEY

NEW COMMENTARIES ON NEW TESTAMENT EPISTLES

The flow of the smaller commentaries goes on unabated and the quality remains high. Here are contributions from three of the current streams. In the 'Torch' series Dr. William Neil has written on *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians* (S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net). Little has happened to change Dr. Neil's views since he produced his 'Moffatt Commentary' a few years ago. In this shorter work he concentrates on the main religious issues, leaving us to consult the larger treatment for detailed criticism. He stresses the importance of these two somewhat neglected letters for the light they throw on the life and hope of the Early Church, and on the mind of St. Paul. He offers a simple explanation of the reason for the two letters, reconciles their eschatological teaching, and sees no reason to deny the common authorship. The

comment is simple, terse, relevant. Unlike the Apostle, he does not repeat himself and has much less to say about the Second Epistle. However, he makes much more sense of 2 Th $2^{1ff.}$ than many of his predecessors and reminds us of the basic meaning of Apocalyptic—' theological conviction expressed in terms of symbol and image which are irreducible to prosaic historical facts.'

Mr. E. C. Blackman's *The Epistle of James* in the same series (S.C.M. ; 10s. 6d. net), however, has drawn on and uses shrewdly a wide range of recent evidence as to patterns of basic moral instruction traditional even in St. Paul's time. Herein we may trace the substance of the Epistle rather than in the views of James as to whose identity Mr. Blackman is, perhaps intentionally, rather vague. We have here neither treatise nor letter but an account of primitive moral instruction influenced by the teaching given to converts and expanded from that formulated in Hellenistic synagogues with some elements expanded into discussion in the manner of a Stoic preacher. Mr. Blackman's comments, often with a brilliant suggestion or witty aside, justify his contention that James has something to say to the ordinary Christian satisfied with a diet of straw. This commentary is hardly comparable with those of Mayor or Ropes, but it is likely to be used more than either.

In the ' Epworth ' series, devoted primarily to the needs of the lay preacher, Mr. Kenneth Grayston has written on *The Epistles to the Galatians and to the Philippians* (Epworth Press ; 9s. 6d. net). He follows the prescribed pattern of the series, giving a brief but adequate introduction and treating the text in carefully divided and accurately entitled sections. In each of these there is first a detailed comment on words and phrases with full cross-references to other parts of Scripture and also to the S.C.M. Theological Word Book and other relevant works. In this way much is said in brief compass on the great Pauline terms. That on ' justified ' is particularly good. There follows general comment on the whole section, pointing the preacher to the major issues and to themes for preaching. This method is seen to particular advantage in the large section Ph 1^{27}–2^{18}. In some cases as, for example, the problems connected with Paul's discussion with the Apostles in Gal $2^{1ff.}$, there is an extended excursus. Few could have done so much in the limited space available. Here is a thoroughly competent piece of work which does for the preacher all he has the right to expect and leaves him free to embody the accurate and stimulating exposition in his preaching.

Finally, we have the latest ' Tyndale ' commentary, that by the Rev. Donald Guthrie, B.D., M.Th., on *The Pastoral Epistles* (Tyndale Press ; 9s. 6d. net). Any one who argues for the authenticity of these letters in the post-Harrison era has need of courage and arguments. Mr. Guthrie is well supplied with both. In a long and carefully constructed introduction, fortified by an appendix examining Harrison's linguistic arguments, he finds these letters ' directed to meet the contemporary situation in Paul's closing days.' The impression that Mr. Guthrie's arguments, while compelling a much more careful phrasing of, for example, the Pauline fragment theory, hardly succeed in re-establishing the tradition, is confirmed by the commentary where, at times, evaluation seems to be determined more by the demands of the Canon than by the intrinsic quality of the text. This must not be taken to deny the many good things here written. A word of gratitude is due to the publishers for producing two hundred and twenty-eight pages of close print at so low a cost.

MARCUS WARD

A PHILOSOPHY OF PERSISTENCE

A book that is not weary in philosophical and religious well-doing is welcome in these days of scattered—if not scatter-brained—speculation. It is refreshing to be offered a volume—*On Selfhood and Godhood* (Allen and Unwin ; 35s. net)—which, refusing uninhibited obeisance to empiricism and linguistics, resolutely maintains a search for the soul of man, hoping to discover through this search an objective basis for religion. To a great extent it succeeds. The author of this latest series of St. Andrews University Gifford Lectures, Professor C. A. Campbell of Glasgow University, firmly holds to the belief that ' the revival of metaphysics in the foreseeable future may not be altogether a traditionalist's pipe-dream.' With this as his basic principle he maintains that to discuss the central question, Is religion true ?, is futile if the reality of a substantival self is denied. It is not an easy book to read, but it more than repays careful study, and shows a most satisfying combination of competence, confidence, and humility.

Professor Campbell's method in the first series is to establish this substantival self, over against popular theories which would reduce the self to a combination of natural elements, loosely cohering and destructive of freedom. His discussion of the freedom of the will is pure gold, and he finds this freedom fully proved in moral effort, with the consequence that the substantival spiritual self has metaphysical implications, or, in other words, has a basis in reality.

This leads on to the main contention of the second series, in which religion is brought into relation with the self. The chief elements in religion are taken to be—supernatural mystery,

worshipfulness, value, and power ; and it is shown, fairly conclusively by reference to the more important religions, that religion inevitably culminates in theism, so that the problem of the truth of religion is really equivalent to that of the truth of theism. The main problem, then, is whether rational theism is self-contradictory. After elaborate discussion Professor Campbell finds that thought and will (which imply defect and therefore contradict perfection) cannot be applied to God otherwise than symbolically, but he holds strongly, aided by his enthusiastic appreciation of Otto's teaching, that this is by no means useless ; it is ' as clearly distinguishable from mere nescience as it is from knowledge in the strict sense.' Symbolism leads to trustworthy conclusions, and a religious superstructure can be raised, closely approximating to Christianity. By elaborate argument it is shown that the principle of non-contradiction (a suitable basis for a Regius Professor of Logic) involves the conclusion that the ultimate reality must be a unity, and a spiritual unity, inasmuch as the unity of mind is superior to the unity exhibited in organisms. Professor Campbell reaches the position that the relation of man to God is that of creature to Creator, but he is reluctantly unwilling to include in this deduction the idea that God is a living presence in the heart and experience of man, manifesting this by specific intervention. But is it not possible that the relation of God to man should be continuous and *also* specific ? The regret over exclusion is comfortingly covered by the concluding remark that ' it is infinitely better to set sail and sink than never to set sail at all,' but is it inevitable that we should sink when we have come so near to harbour under the pilotage of the author of this book ?

W. S. URQUHART

Rediscovering the Words of Faith, by the Rev. Charles T. Sardeson (Abingdon Press ; $2.00), is an interesting and helpful book, but it is very far from being the book that it claims to be. Its subtitle is ' Our Basic Christian Beliefs and What They mean to us To-day.' Mr. Sardeson begins his Preface by saying : ' There is a very simple purpose which runs through the pages that follow. That purpose is to state the essential content found in a few of the words which are necessary for any adequate description of the Christian life.' The words treated are Faith, Revelation, Judgment, Atonement, Grace, Adoption, The Gospel, Sacraments, The Church, The Kingdom of God, Sin, Faith, Worship, Eternal Life, Peace. The trouble about this book is that while it does certain very valuable things, it makes not the slightest attempt to do what it promises to do. There is in fact no investigation whatever of what these words mean. To take a simple example, it is quite impossible to understand what Paul meant by adoption unless the actual act of adoption in the ancient world is investigated, and this book makes no attempt to do that. This book shows a complete disregard of all linguistic and lexicographical study, and of everything in the Hellenistic and Jewish background of Christianity which settled the meanings of these words.

Mr. Sardeson, for instance, writes : ' Adoption is rather like stepping from the darkness into a lighted room. It is the movement from loneliness to companionship, from insecurity to reassuring certainty, and from unknowing into great glimpses of the truth. Adoption is God's action by which He claims you along with every other believer into His family, into that blessed, luminous company of dedicated souls who are as they are because they are part of something vast and abiding and Godly.' He writes : ' The fundamental definition of sin must be a religious one, for sin is that which breaks fellowship with God. It is unbelief. It is wilfully perverting life from God's high destiny. Sin is an unwillingness to be God's children. It is an insistence on trying to be God. It is a feverish determination to put yourself at the centre of life and refuse to let God in. It is a stubborn rebellion against the God who loves you and formed you to be His own. It is denying your sonship in "thought, word and deed."' No one would deny that all this is true, but it is fine writing, not definition.

This is a good book, well worth reading, but let no one think from its title or from its claim that he is going to receive real teaching on the great words. The real teaching material has been completely neglected, so that what claims to be a book of basic teaching has become simply another book of exhortatory sermons.

The title of this book—*Lamb to the Slaughter*, by Brother George Every, S.S.M. (James Clarke ; 7s. 6d. net)—is suggestive but slightly enigmatical, and a certain obscurity of style and the absence of directive arrangement of the chapters add to our perplexities in the course of perusal. The author has made an exhaustive study of the ritual of sacrifice from the earliest times and to the bounds of the world and is usefully critical of many current theories. His thesis would seem to be that a proper understanding of sacrifice would divert our attention from the thought of sacrifice as an offering made by us, to awareness of the succour which comes *to* us from the victim of the sacrifice. More definitely he urges that we should connect more closely baptism and the eucharist, as some ritual forms actually do, provided we can think of baptism as a sacrificial surrender to the possibility of suffering, death and resurrection. We should

base our faith not so much on the idea of God providing a victim to satisfy our shortcomings in relation to God, but rather on God as offering Himself as a victim, saving us by the love which enters to the uttermost into the suffering experiences of humanity, especially those which men bring upon themselves by their sinfulness and their selfishness and conservatism. It is a book which should make us think more deeply on the meaning of our sacramental worship.

We have received from Messrs. A. R. Mowbray three small books in their ' Fleur de Lys ' series. They are *A Letter to his Sister*, by St. Aelred of Rievaulx (5s. net) ; *Meditations to the Holy Spirit*, by An Augustinian (4s. net) ; and *The Steps of Humility*, by Saint Bernard (6s. net).

The first of these little books was written about 1160 for the guidance of the saint's sister who was an anchoress. It is based on the Rule of St. Benedict as interpreted at Citeaux, for St. Aelred was a Cistercian. It appears to be the first Rule for an anchoress written in Great Britain and is quoted in the later Ancren Riwle. In addition to practical details, the author bids his sister meditate on things past (especially the Passion, Death and Resurrection of our Lord), things present, such as God's patience, mercy, grace and goodness, and the things to come—Judgment, Doomsday and Heaven. The meditations on Scripture are the most moving and relevant to the modern reader.

Meditations to the Holy Spirit is translated and edited by a Wantage Nun, who says in her Introduction : ' Pseudo-Augustine of the Holy Ghost is neither a polished writer, nor a tidy thinker. He repeats himself, he is at times obscure, at others dull ; and not infrequently he loads his sentences until they are like the White Knight and his horse. Amongst all this, and in his own direct, impulsive way, he says a lot for which the twentieth century may bless him no less than the fifteenth.' One reader, at least, emerged from the book very conscious of the dullness and repetition, and not at all inclined to bless.

It is a relief to turn to St. Bernard. He gave a number of talks to the brethren in the Chapter on the twelve steps of humility as set out by St. Benedict in his Rule. The work is, therefore, addressed to monks, but its simple, concrete style makes it of value for us all. Humility is the very foundation of the spiritual life, because by it we know ourselves, and so judge ourselves, but this judgment is tempered by charity. St. Bernard spends most of his time, however, on a reversal of the twelve degrees of humility. He considers conversely twelve degrees of pride, drawing vivid pictures of negligent monks slipping down that way. Others than monks will realize uncomfortably how easy the downward progress is, as the author traces it inexorably from inquisitiveness to the habit of sinning.

Begin Here ! Discussion Topics for Young People, edited by Mr. Ernest H. Hayes (Religious Education Press ; 7s. 6d. net), has as its aim ' to meet the needs of leaders of groups of Young People between the ages of fourteen and sixteen who have had little or no Sunday School experience or religious training in the home.' Let it be said at once that it admirably fulfils its aim. It has eleven sections. (1) ' Couldn't care less,' in which such an attitude to God, the Bible, the Church, and Prayer is discussed. (2) ' Who's to blame ? ', in which such living issues as the hydrogen bomb and strikes and industrial unrest are discussed. (3) ' Popular Fallacies,' in which such sayings as, ' I can get away with it,' ' White lies hurt nobody,' are examined. (4) ' Is it fair ? ', in which riches and poverty, accidents and disease, and even the call up are talked about. (5) ' Be your age,' which discusses good manners and behaviour in the home. (6) ' Everybody does it,' in which there is penetrating treatment of such subjects as betting, drinking and smoking. (7) ' That's his Funeral,' in which such subjects as petty theft and sex relations are frankly discussed. (8) ' It makes me mad,' in which subjects like favouritism and injustice, and ' being pushed around ' are treated. (9) ' Do you expect me to believe—? ', in which, among other subjects, the miracles and life after death are discussed. (10) ' Murder by Agreement,' in which the death of Jesus is examined both in its history and its meaning. (11) ' The Living Flame,' which deals with the work of the Holy Spirit.

We have given this full account of the contents of this book, in which many writers have collaborated, to show the width of the material it handles. It indicates methods and sketches ways in which each subject may be treated ; it provides illustrations and Bible Study ; and it always includes an act of worship.

This book is strongly to be recommended. Inevitably its treatment of all subjects is not equally successful, but in every case the treatment is honest and stimulating and thought-provoking. It does not provide conclusions ; it encourages people to reach their own conclusions. In the section which discusses whether Jesus really lived two references to Latin literature are given. The Tacitus reference is given simply as *Annales xv.* If any one wishes really to check that reference it ought to be *Annales*, XV. xliv. 2 ; the Pliny correspondence reference is given as *Epistles xx.* ; that ought to be *Epistles*, X. xcvi. 97. In a book which claims to give the real evidence accuracy of reference is essential.

Retreats

By the Reverend Canon Frederic Hood, D.D., London

'Come ye yourselves apart,' said our Lord, 'and rest a while: for there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat.' How vividly these words draw our attention to the urgent need for times of quiet in the stress of modern life. A Retreat, properly so called, is a time—two or three days, as a rule, for ordinary people—spent in complete silence, consciously waiting upon the will of God and listening to His voice. In a series of carefully planned meditations, generally three a day, the conductor leads the retreatants on to desire detachment from the unnecessary comforts which may be deterring them from carrying out God's will, to be truly contrite and ready to amend, to learn to pray and meditate better. All is centred in the daily Eucharist. During meals some one reads aloud. My own practice is to read the Bible at breakfast, and a good biography or something similar at lunch and supper. It is not desirable to read anything which induces undue merriment or loud laughter. It is important that the afternoon should be given to rest and recreation, for a well-kept Retreat can be exhausting. To break the rule of silence will wreck the Retreat. It must be made clear, however, that this rule is not 'for a wager,' and does not apply to simple requests (*e.g.*, to pass the butter at a meal).

In his monumental work *A Study of History*, Dr. Arnold Toynbee lays stress on 'Withdrawal and Return' as a constantly reappearing *motif* in all great leaders of movements. 'The withdrawal makes it possible for the personality to realize powers within himself which might have remained dormant if he had not been released for the time being from his social toils and trammels. Such a withdrawal may be a voluntary action on his part or it may be forced upon him by circumstances beyond his control; in either case the withdrawal is an opportunity and perhaps a necessary condition for . . . transfiguration. . . . But a transfiguration in solitude can have no purpose . . . except as a prelude to the return of the transfigured personality into the social *milieu* out of which he had originally come. . . . The return is the essence of the whole movement as well as its final cause' (Abridged edition, p. 217). Another relevant passage, which I quote without prejudice as regards the acceptance or otherwise of Dr. Toynbee's views on the consciousness of our Lord in His mortal life, is as follows: 'When Jesus becomes conscious of His mission, upon His baptism by John, He withdraws into the wilderness for forty days, and returns from His temptation there in the power of the spirit. . . . When Jesus realizes that His mission is to lead to His death, He withdraws again into the "high mountain apart," which is the scene of His Transfiguration and returns from this experience resigned and resolved to die. . . . When He duly suffers the death of mortal man in the Crucifixion, He descends into the tomb in order to rise immortal in the Resurrection. And last of all, in the Ascension, He withdraws from earth to heaven in order to "come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead: whose kingdom shall have no end"' (*op. cit.*, 222). Thus the principle of genuine Retreat goes deeper even than the life of the Church, its origin being in the very make-up and expression of human life in any upward and forward movement. I remember the late Lord Sankey telling me of an urgent invitation which he received from Gandhi to attend a prayer meeting. Lord Sankey travelled a long distance across London to fulfil this engagement—I think it was at the very time when he was Lord Chancellor. An impressive prayer meeting was held, but no word was spoken.

A famous Frenchman (Gerbet) said 'Everything which provides the soul with a dose of calm, even to a small degree, is always a service rendered to the mind.' This exactly describes a Retreat. We come away from a troubled world into a period of stillness, but this is no opiate: the silence is not the end. St. Peter was not allowed to build three tents so that our Lord might linger on the Mount of Hermon. The Master must return to the world and in the power of His great mystical experience He heals the epileptic boy. The disciples had in this case failed through lack of faith and prayer and self-denial.

We remain quiet that we may grow in our love for God in all His majesty and holiness, see how we stand with Him, detect unsatisfactory tendencies in our spiritual lives, and thus fit ourselves (whether ministers or laymen) to be pastors of souls, radiating Christ's healing power. Thus a Retreat may be thought of as a spiritual 'stocktaking,' comparable to many necessary activities in secular life—accounts being prepared for audit, the car being overhauled, the house being spring-cleaned.

If full value is to be obtained from a Retreat, it is essential that it should be thorough. It is not a

time to prepare sermons or speeches or to catch up with correspondence, much less for social intercourse.

Almost every one who has experienced two or three days of complete silence (except for spiritual converse with the conductor), with the deliberate object of getting nearer to God, discovers its unique value, and is impelled to return year by year. Boys and girls find themselves quite happy in retreat, though in the case of earlier age-groups, periods of complete silence must obviously not be too long.

As life goes on, some prefer to make a private Retreat, rather than to attend a conducted one, but for the large majority it is advisable for an experienced minister to be at hand to guide the retreatant in systematic meditation. A practical thing which should be done in retreat each year is revision of one's prayer list (and possibly one's rule of life). Even in a private Retreat, discipline is necessary. It is wise to keep a detailed note of how the time is spent.

What then are 'Retreat Conferences,' of which we hear so much? We are often invited to go away for several days to attend gatherings thus described. There may be silence for all or part of each morning and after night prayers, the remaining time being spent in discussion and recreation. I would suggest that a more profitable plan would be strictly to divide Retreat from Conference, the whole of the time of silence preceding discussion. It is only a question of rearranging the available time.

Retreats were first systematized in the sixteenth century by Ignatius Loyola. His famous exercises, which took thirty days fully to complete, were designed to lead people to conquer appetites and surrender to God by consideration of sin and its consequences, the Kingdom of Christ, His Passion and Resurrection to glory, using sense impressions, the imagination, the understanding and the will, in order to subject the whole man to God.

The revival of Retreats in the Anglican Communion began a hundred years ago, when a number of clergymen assembled in Dr. Pusey's lodgings at Christ Church at the instigation of Charles Lowder. That was in 1856: and two years later Richard Meux Benson conducted his first Retreat at Cowley. To him more than any one else the movement in its early stages was indebted. Though this revival was in fact the work of the Tractarians, the principle of Retreat is clearly independent of ecclesiastical outlook. Retreats are increasingly valued by Central and Evangelical churchmen, and are held by Quakers in America, Lutherans in Germany and Sweden, Calvinists in Holland and Switzerland—to mention only a few of the Protestants concerned. The Rev. R. G. Coulson, author of that remarkable book *Into God*, is leader of a group of some thirty 'Priest Contemplatives,' most of them, like himself, in the Evangelical tradition. They go into full Retreat together annually.

Whatever view may be taken of Dr. Billy Graham's theological outlook, all must admire the constant self-sacrificing prayer which lies behind his campaigns. Before his Crusades at Harringay and Wembley, whole nights of prayer were held fortnightly over a long period in seven centres in London, three of them Anglican and four Nonconformist. I am informed, however, that vocal (and audible) prayer is continuous throughout these nights, and that by 1 or 2 a.m. one has to wait twenty minutes or more to get in a word. It is significant that in St. John's vision in Patmos 'there was silence in heaven about the space of half an hour.' I ventured to suggest to Dr. Graham himself that the nights of prayer might be of even greater value if some considerable part of the time were spent in silent waiting upon God. He received the suggestion with his characteristic graciousness, but I doubt if it has had any result.

I am sometimes asked whether Quiet Days or Afternoons are better than nothing and I am convinced that, if the silence is observed thoroughly, the answer is affirmative. For many years I was Principal of Pusey House, Oxford, and there, in addition to two annual Retreats, we had a four-hour Quiet Afternoon for undergraduates in each of the winter terms. Many palpable spiritual fruits emerged from these, not least the desire in many cases for longer times of quiet.

The special assignment of the Guild Church of St. Mary Aldermary, of which I am Vicar, is the promotion of Retreats and the devotional life. Every year we have Quiet Afternoons in preparation for Advent and Lent; eighty or ninety avail themselves of each of these opportunities. We are also now experimenting with Quiet Evenings, specially intended for the wives of clergymen, Church workers, etc. Such periods of silence are of real value between annual Retreats and may well serve to prepare beginners for the discipline of longer silence. It is also my privilege to be President of the Association for Promoting Retreats,[1] the Patron of which is Dr. William Wand. Among the Vice-Presidents are the Archbishop of York and the Dean of Windsor. Members of this Association undertake to pray regularly for the Retreat movement; to make an annual Retreat, if it is at all possible; to interest others in the work, and to do what they can to encourage the provision of facilities for Retreats in their own neighbourhood. The Association has an office in London, where advice can be given to inquirers: it provides speakers on the life of prayer, and its representatives are scattered all over England, Scotland and

[1] 1 Wesley Street, London, W.1

Wales, as agents to help forward the Retreat movement. Instructions in Retreat conducting are given in various centres for the benefit of those who wish to specialize in this work. Literature dealing with Retreats and for use in Retreat is published; and a periodical called *The Vision* comes out twice a year, and includes as complete a list as possible of Retreats which have been arranged in the seventy Houses which are specially set apart for this purpose in various parts of the country. Correspondence from non-Anglicans makes it clear that the Retreat movement is coming to life outside the Church of England.

In many parishes a parochial Retreat is arranged annually. These are of two kinds. A number of the faithful (say twenty to thirty) may be taken away from Friday evening till Sunday night or early Monday morning to a Retreat House, under the care of an experienced conductor. But this is expensive, and only meets the needs of a few. The Retreat may be held at home. It can start on Saturday after tea with prayers and an address. There can be coffee and sandwiches at a convenient time, then a second address—and the evening will end with night prayers. These should not be too early, as the retreatants should go straight to bed when they get home, and not be tempted to watch Television or chat with the family. On Sunday the usual programme of a Retreat (addresses delivered on a careful psychological plan, etc.) can be fitted in with the services. Meals must be provided in a church hall or room nearby. The Retreat will end after Holy Communion and breakfast on Monday morning.

The Retreat envisaged is in the Anglican framework, but can clearly be easily adapted to other traditions of worship.

A story (possibly apocryphal) is current about a famous American evangelist. A young man, unversed in the methods of the movement with which this evangelist was concerned, arrived at a house party and inquired of the great man 'Is this a Retreat?' The enthusiastic reply, in broad American, was 'No, it's an Advance.' Sometimes Retreat is the surest method of advance in holiness and that is the secret of spiritual power.

Devotional and Pastoral Classics

Brother Lawrence's 'The Practice of the Presence of God'

By the Reverend Denis Lant, Edinburgh

The Practice of the Presence of God is probably the most popular of the devotional classics and has suffered accordingly. It has been issued in various little books in the same way as *The Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám* and has met a similar fate: the little book has frequently not been read or else it has been read and has not been understood.

Brother Lawrence was in secular life Nicholas Herman, a native of Lorraine. He was born in 1611 and was converted in 1629 in a rather curious way. Alfred Noyes has expressed it as his opinion that if Spring came once in a thousand years we should regard it as an unanswerable proof of the existence of God. Similarly Nicholas suddenly 'saw' a leafless tree in Winter 'and considering that within a little time the leaves would be renewed, and after that the flowers and fruit appear, he received a high view of the Providence and Power of God, which has never since been effaced from his soul.' He was a soldier and apparently while serving he received an injury which left him lame for the rest of his life. This lameness seems to have been responsible for his discharge from the Army and we next hear of him as footman to M. Fieubert, the Treasurer, and learn that 'he was a great awkward fellow, who broke everything.' Subsequently he was admitted to the House of the Discalced Carmelites in Paris where he stayed until his death at the age of eighty. The Discalced Carmelites were the Reform of the Order which was carried through by St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross.

The Practice of the Presence of God is not one book, but simply accounts of four conversations with Brother Lawrence, and sixteen letters, either by or about him. The conversations were written down by M. Beaufort, Grand Vicar to Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, by whose recommendation they were published. The first three conversations took place in 1666 and the fourth in 1667.

The only work known to be by Brother Lawrence is *Spiritual Maxims, or Means for Attaining to the Presence of God.* In a short life of him written in 1691 we are told that 'he committed his thoughts sometimes to writing, but comparing what he had written with that which he had just experienced in his soul, he deemed it so inferior and so far removed from the inspired thoughts with which he had been visited of the greatness and goodness of God that often he felt compelled to

tear it up at once.' The *Maxims* and *Letters* seem to be all that survive of his writings. There is, however, another manuscript which is of interest to us. It is *The Character of Brother Lawrence* and is the work of M. Beaufort, the chronicler of his conversations. Neither the *Maxims* nor the *Character* are well-known. Indeed after an edition of the *Maxims* published in Edinburgh in 1741 there does not seem to have been another for over a hundred and fifty years.

For some reason the date of Brother Lawrence's entry into the Carmel has been given as 1666, at which date he would have been fifty-five. This seems obviously wrong for two reasons :

(1) The first three conversations would then have taken place in the year of his entry and the fourth in the following year. Their tone and wealth of experience seem all against this.

(2) The evidence of the letters denies this date. The second letter, written in 1682, speaks of 'the forty years and more that he has spent in religion' while in the tenth, dated in 1689, he says to the Reverend Mother to whom he is writing, 'You and I have lived more than forty years in religion.' This would date his entry about 1645 when he was thirty-four years old, and seems more probable.

Brother Lawrence was obviously a simple soul, not aspiring to any intellectual distinction. He was never more than a Lay Brother and for fifteen years he served in his monastery's kitchen. This was against his actual *attrait* for quiet, and the work was sometimes rendered difficult by his lameness. At one point we are told 'That he had been lately sent into Burgundy to buy the provision of wine for the Society, which was a very unwelcome task to him, because he had no turn for business, and because he was lame, and could not go about the boat, but by rolling himself over the casks. That, however, he gave himself no uneasiness about it, nor about the purchase of the wine. That he said to God, *It was His business he was about*; and that he afterwards found it very well performed.' 'And it was observed, that in the greatest hurry of business in the kitchen, he still preserved his recollection and his heavenly-mindedness. He was never hasty nor loitering, but did each thing in its season, with an even, uninterrupted composure and tranquillity of spirit. "The time of business," said he, "does not with me differ from the time of prayer, and in the noise and clatter of my kitchen, while several persons are at the same time calling for different things, I possess God in as great tranquillity, as if I were upon my knees at the Blessed Sacrament." '

It is, of course, this sustained sense of the presence of God for which Brother Lawrence is so well-known and which gives its title to the book. How did he attain it ? He has no 'method' and indeed short-circuits them all. He said 'That all bodily mortifications and other exercises are useless, but as they serve to arrive at the union with God by love : that he had well considered this, and found it the shortest way, to go straight to Him by a continual practice of love, and doing all things for His sake.' 'That many do not advance in the Christian progress because they stick in penances and particular exercises, while they neglect the love of God which is the *end* ; . . . That there was need neither of art nor science for going to God, but only a heart resolutely determined to apply itself to nothing but Him, or for *His* sake, and to love Him only.' 'That he was more united to God in his ordinary occupations, than when he left them for devotion in retirement, from which he knew himself to issue with much dryness of spirit.' 'That it was a great delusion to think that the times of prayer ought to differ from other times : that we were as strictly obliged to adhere to God by action in the time of action as by prayer in its season.' '. . . that the goodness of God assured him that He would not forsake him utterly, and that He would give to him strength to bear whatever evil He permitted to befall him : and that he therefore feared nothing, and had no occasion to take counsel with anybody about his soul. That when he had attempted to do it, he had always come away more perplexed ; . . .' 'That in the beginning of his noviciate, he spent the hours appointed for private prayer in thinking of God, so as to convince his mind of, and to impress deeply upon his heart, the Divine existence, rather by devout sentiments, than by studied reasonings, and elaborate meditation.' 'How can we pray to Him, without being with Him ? How can we be with Him, but in thinking of Him often ? And how can we have Him often in our thoughts, unless by a holy habit of thought which we should form ? You will tell me that I am always saying the same thing : it is true, for this is the best and easiest method that I know ; and as I use no other, I advise the whole world to it. We must *know* before we can *love*. In order to *know* God, we must often *think* of Him ; and when we come to *love* Him, we shall *also think* of Him often, *for our heart will be with our treasure* ! Ponder over this often, ponder it well.'

So the little lay-brother avoided all prayer methods, all multiplication of prayers and saw no need of a spiritual director. He went straight to God keeping Him in his heart by recollection and love.

The tragedy has been that the readers of many little copies of the book have concluded that this was easy. But Brother Lawrence tells us of four

years' agony at the beginning when he was certain that his soul was lost. Indeed he says 'for the first ten years I suffered much.' He tells us that he knew aridity and darkness and that distractions were always with him. 'At times a crowd of wandering wild fancies would invade his mind and take violent possession of the place of God' (*Character*). Moreover, his sense of God's presence was won only through hard discipline. M. Beaufort says 'We must not, however, fancy that to learn to love God it suffices to offer Him our acts and entreat His aid and shew forth works of love. Brother Lawrence only attained to the perfection of his love because from the very outset he had laid stern discipline upon himself to do nothing which might be displeasing to God, and because, forgetting self, he had renounced all for His sake' (*Character*). Alas for the readers of little books! As Céline said of her sister St. Thérèse of Lisieux, under the heap of roses lay the iron of the cross. There is indeed no quick and easy way to sanctity.

But Brother Lawrence persisted. '. . . when he had failed in his duty, he simply confessed his fault, saying to God, "I shall never do otherwise, if Thou leavest me to myself; 'tis Thou must hinder my falling, and mend what is amiss." That after this, he gave himself no farther uneasiness about it.' So he came to realize 'that our sanctification did not depend upon changing our works, but in doing for God's sake that which commonly we do for our own.' He knew, with Fénelon, that nothing is small if God asks it of us and it was happiness to him to pick up a straw from the ground for the love of God.

Later he says, 'I have quitted all forms of devotion and set prayers, save those to which my state obliges me. And I make it my only business to persevere in His Holy Presence, wherein I keep myself by a simple attention and an absorbing passionate regard to God, which I may call an *actual Presence of God*; or to speak better, a silent and secret, constant intercourse of the soul with God, which often causes in me joys and raptures inwardly, and sometimes also outwardly, so great, that I am forced to use means to moderate them and prevent their appearance to others.'

Finally, M. Beaufort tells us that 'On the morrow, which was Monday, the 12th of February 1691, at nine o'clock in the morning, without any pain or struggle, without losing in the slightest the use of any of his faculties, Brother Lawrence passed away in the embrace of his Lord, and rendered his soul to God in the peace and calm of one who had fallen on sleep.'

Mark xiii. and the Greek Old Testament

By the Reverend T. Francis Glasson, M.A., D.D., London

It is generally recognized that many verses of the discourse of Mk 13 reflect passages of the Old Testament. This fact, of course, is quite compatible with the belief that it consists entirely of genuine words of our Lord, since His frequent use of the Old Testament is beyond question. It has been pointed out, however, that in various parts of the chapter it is the Greek translation of the Old Testament which is reflected, and in some instances the Greek words quoted differ from the Hebrew in meaning. This would support the contention that some parts of the chapter were drawn up in Greek on the basis of the Greek Old Testament.

Verses 24–27 have a high proportion of Old Testament phrases and we can recognize Is 13^{10} and 34^{4} behind *vv.* 24f. Isaiah 13^{10} ('the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine') need not detain us. But the other passage of Isaiah is of special interest as it is clearly the Greek and not the Hebrew which is reflected in Mk 13. The Hebrew of Is 34^{4} has: 'And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved . . . and all their host shall fade away.' The LXX has: 'And all the powers of the heavens (αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν) shall melt . . . and all the stars shall fall (τὰ ἄστρα πεσεῖται).'

Mark 13^{25} has: 'And the stars shall be falling from heaven (οἱ ἀστέρες ἔσονται . . . πίπτοντες), and the powers that are in the heavens (αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) shall be shaken.' It will be noticed that the Hebrew has the word 'host' twice, but the LXX in one case has 'powers' instead, and in the other case it has 'stars.' A third alteration is that the stars are said to fall, whereas the word 'fall' does not occur in the Hebrew.[1] Mark 13^{25} has 'powers' and 'stars', and the stars are said to fall. So that *on three counts* Mk 13 agrees with the LXX against the Hebrew in this single passage. This can be set out as follows:

Hebrew	*LXX*	*Mk 13*
the host of heaven	the powers of the heavens	the powers that are in the heavens
their host shall fade away	the stars shall fall	the stars shall be falling

[1] Falling stars do not occur anywhere in the Hebrew Bible. The fall of Lucifer, the day star, in Is 14^{12} is scarcely an exception.

Again in Mk 13^{27} we have the words : ' and shall gather together his elect from the four winds ' (ἐπισυνάξει . . . ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων). The R.V. margin, Westcott and Hort, and Nestle all direct us to Zec 2^{6} where the LXX reads : ' from the four winds of heaven will I gather you ' (ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων . . . συνάξω ὑμᾶς). The Hebrew is quite different and reads : ' For I have spread you abroad as the four winds of the heaven.' According to Duhm this does not refer to dispersion, but looks back to the unwalled city—it will spread out and expand on every side as it is unconfined by walls.[1] According to some authorities the LXX here represents the original Hebrew (see *Biblia Hebraica*, Kittel-Kahle), and Moffatt translates on this basis. This is quite possible ; but it is perhaps easier to account for an alteration from ' spread abroad ' to ' gather ' than an alteration in the reverse direction.

A number of passages which need to be examined come from the Book of Daniel and in this connexion it should be remembered that, in the New Testament, quotations from Daniel mostly stand with Theodotion where he differs from the LXX. Although Theodotion made his translation near the end of the second century A.D., it seems clear that his rendering of Daniel owed much to an earlier version which differed from the LXX and which was known to the New Testament writers.[2] In the following all our citations from Daniel are from Theodotion unless otherwise stated.

The phrase δεῖ γενέσθαι in Mk 13^{7} (' these things *must come to pass* ') is put in heavy type in Nestle's Greek Testament with a marginal reference to Dn 2^{28}. Westcott and Hort also put the words in the special type which indicates Old Testament citations and allusions, and in their list of Old Testament quotations Dn 2^{28} is given as the source. The phrase found in the Greek of Daniel (ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι) is an almost recognized apocalyptic term, and occurs in Rev 1^{1} 4^{1} and 22^{6} all of which speak of the things which must come to pass. It should be pointed out that the saying of Mt $26^{53f.}$ concerning the twelve legions of angels which Jesus refused to summon also makes use of similar words, but there they occur more naturally and neither Nestle nor WH distinguish them. But in the case of Mk 13^{7} and the passages cited from Revelation we have the kind of context where such a phrase more nearly resembles an apocalyptic formula. Daniel 2^{28} falls in the Aramaic section of the book, and the original here has merely the future, ' what *shall* be in the latter days.' It is the Greek that supplies ' what *must* be '.[3]

The striking phrase ' abomination of desolation ' in Mk 13^{14} is universally admitted to be from Daniel, and this is even stated in Mt 24^{15}. The words do not exactly correspond to the Hebrew, which is rather the abomination that maketh desolate or that horrifies ; see Dn 12^{11} and 11^{31}, where the R.V. has ' the abomination that maketh desolate '.[4] (The abomination of desolation appears also in the historical record in 1 Mac 1^{54}, βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως ; and soon after we find that Mattathias and his sons—who were not in Jerusalem itself but belonged to Modin, one of the cities of Judah affected by the apostasy, cf. $2^{1.\ 6.\ 18}$—' fled into the mountains ' [2^{27} : ἔφυγον . . . εἰς τὰ ὄρη]. It is an interesting coincidence, if nothing more, that when the abomination of desolation appears again in the end-time [Mk 13^{14}] the same verse says that those who are in Judaea are to flee to the mountains : φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη).

The two chapters of Daniel just referred to, 11–12, are of special importance in understanding the apocalyptic passages of the New Testament ; and the tribulation of Mk 13^{19} is clearly from Dn 12^{1}. Mark speaks of ' tribulation, such as there hath not been the like (θλῖψις οἵα οὐ γέγονεν) from the beginning of the creation which God created until now '. In Dn 12^{1} we have : ' There shall be a time

[1] He connects *v.* 6b with *v.* 5 : ' And I myself, is the saying of Iahweh, will be a fiery wall all around it and for a glory in its midst, for I will spread you out like the four winds of heaven ' (*The Twelve Prophets* [Eng. Tr.], 178).

[2] The matter is discussed at some length in G. Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament* [1886], 586–600. See also H. B. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 47 ; J. F. Stenning, art. ' Bible ' in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* [14th ed.] ; and W. F. Howard in *Bible in Ancient and English Versions*, ed. H. W. Robinson, 52. C. H. Dodd says of Theodotion in *According to the Scriptures* : ' The translation of Daniel known to New Testament writers appears generally to be similar to this version rather than to the LXX ' (p. 69 n.).

In my book *The Second Advent*, 188, I have referred to the Greek of Daniel as ' LXX,' where strictly I should have said ' Theodotion ' ; I was employing a copy of the Septuagint in which Daniel was represented by Theodotion, as at one time was always the case. In view of the above the point is of no moment, as it is a matter of terms. One correction I should like to make is that αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν occurs only in Mt 24^{29} and not in Mk 13^{25} (as stated on p. 186). Mark 13^{25} has αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς except in D and a few other authorities where the words have been harmonized to match Matthew's phrase.

[3] In *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, ii. 21–25, there is an article by Grundmann on the word δεῖ, in which special reference is given to the Danielic clause. He mentions that the words of Dn 2^{28} (Greek) were taken over in the Book of Revelation ; and he adds, ' *Auch in der synoptischen Apokalypse kehrt diese Formulierung wieder* '.

[4] In Dn 12^{11} Theodotion has βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως, LXX τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως. For other variations see 9^{27} and 11^{31}.

of trouble, such as never was (*θλῖψις οἵα οὐ γέγονεν*) since there was a nation even to that same time'. The Greek words represent quite fairly the meaning of the Hebrew; but they are not the only words possible (as the Chigi MS. of the LXX shows) and this close agreement supports the suggestion that parts of this Marcan section rest upon the Greek Old Testament.

A further example may possibly be found in Mk 13^{13}: 'he that endureth to the end shall be saved'. The R.V. compares this with Dn $12^{12\text{-}13}$; this marginal reference is only an indication of a similar passage, not a suggestion that Daniel is the *source* of the Marcan saying. But the latter may well be the case, in view of the reflections of Dn 11–12 we have observed.[1] 'The end' in Mk 13^{13} may mean the end of the tribulation, answering to 'the *beginning* of travail' in *v.* 8. For the general idea we may compare 2 Esd 6^{25}: 'whosoever shall have survived all these things that I have foretold unto thee, he shall be saved. . . .' Although the tribulation in Mk 13 is not named as such until 13^{19}, the same situation appears in this earlier section. In both sections the word 'saved' occurs; if the tribulation were not shortened 'no flesh would have been saved.'[2] 'The end' in Mk 13^{13} thus corresponds to the climax mentioned in Dn 12^{12}. If this is the explanation it should be noticed that the agreement is closer in the Greek than the Hebrew. The Hebrew has 'he that waiteth,' but the Greek 'he that endureth' (*ὁ ὑπομένων*) the same verb as in Mark (*ὁ ὑπομείνας*).

It is important to notice that the Old Testament allusions in this chapter are not in the nature of direct quotations. Where our Lord quotes a passage of Scripture following such a saying as 'Have ye not read . . .' it was natural that the evangelists should at times make use of the LXX. But in the case of Mk 13 there are no direct citations of any length. When therefore we find behind phrases and allusions traces of the Greek version, the coincidence cannot be explained in this way since we are not dealing with passages quoted at length. That these allusions are not exactly the same as the Old Testament Greek is hardly a difficulty. Moreover, it should be made clear that most responsible authorities of recent years have recognized that a good deal in this chapter goes back to our Lord Himself, The presence of Semitisms here and there is to be expected both for this and for other reasons, and does not destroy the evidence given in the foregoing.

Many have hesitated in ascribing to our Lord the whole of the chapter as it stands, because of the difficulty of imagining that He would indulge in the kind of forecast it represents. It is urged that some of the sayings are of the very stuff of apocalyptic. One event of eschatological tradition is inevitably followed by another. Also the phrases, 'abomination of desolation' and others, are not such as He normally used. The fastening together of Old Testament passages in *vv.* 24–27 is without parallel in Mark. However, these hesitations are sometimes dismissed as due to subjective prejudice.

In studying the actual language of the chapter we have a more objective standard. When we find in Mk 13 repeated agreement with the Greek of the Old Testament, even where the Greek differs from the Hebrew, one's conviction is strengthened that genuine words of Jesus have been expanded with material from elsewhere.

[1] There may be others; the conflicts and 'rumours' of Dn $11^{40\text{ff.}}$ (cf. *ἀκοαί* 44) may lie behind the wars and rumours (*ἀκοαί*) of Mk 13^{7}.

[2] Cf. Dn 12^{1}; 'thy people, every one written in the book, shall be saved (*σωθήσεται*).'

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Saved by His Teeth

By the Reverend James Wright, M.A.,
Boat of Garten

Earlier this year, there was celebrated in a village in Dumfriesshire the hundredth anniversary of the birth of one of the brave band of Scotsmen, of whom David Livingstone was the first, who by their pioneer journeys opened up Africa. His name was Joseph Thomson. He explored many parts of the Dark Continent which no white man had seen before, and of course had many a hair's-breadth escape from death. One time, a band of fierce natives set upon him and were on the point of killing him with their spears. He put up his hand and took from his mouth the two artificial teeth which were there, held them out for a moment and then popped them back into his mouth again. The wild Africans had never seen the like of that before and at once their hostility changed to awe. This man was magic. But soon their awe turned to curiosity and they crowded round him and one took hold of his nose and tried to pull it out and others took hold of his ears and tried to pull them out but they couldn't of course. His nose and his ears were part of his body.

As St. Paul tells us in his twelfth chapter of First Corinthians, the parts of our body are not

just loosely stuck together. They are all one and, if one part is hurt, the rest of the body is hurt too. If these Africans had succeeded in pulling out the explorer's nose and ears, his whole body might well have died.

And St. Paul goes on to tell us that Jesus makes His followers feel that they are united like that with other people, so that if they see another person distressed or disgraced, they feel distressed and disgraced too. If, then, you see another boy or girl crippled or odd or soft, and begin to get fun out of it, you are certainly the very reverse of a Christian. I remember getting the licking of my life from my father because I had mocked at the 'dummy' of our village—he could neither hear nor speak. That was my father's way of making sure that, since I had made him suffer, I should suffer also. I think I learned the lesson and so far as I remember I never did anything like that again. But there is a better way to learn that lesson. Let Jesus give you His spirit and make you like Himself, who was always afflicted in other people's afflictions and felt them as His own. Then you will love your neighbour as yourself, for you will feel that he is part of yourself.

What is Your Accent?

By the Reverend H. Lovering Picken,
Swinbrook, Oxford

'Your accent betrays you.'—Mt 26[73] (R.S.V.).

In the window of a little shop where you can buy all you want from a pound of bacon to a frying pan, or from a pair of nylons to a bottle of cough mixture, there has hung for several years a cage in which a canary called Joey lives. Every now and again he fills the shop with his song. The louder the customers chatter the louder does Joey sing!

Now, about two years ago, another cage was hung close to Joey's and in this lived Bluey a cobalt blue budgerigar, who though very handsome certainly could not sing. The best he could do was to make a shrill chattering noise and play little tricks with a mirror and a tiny bell.

But Bluey, if he could not sing, could and did listen—listen with his little head cocked on one side and his bright, beady eyes fixed on Joey the canary, his throat puffed out like a little feathered ball the while he warbled.

As the weeks passed by, Joey and Bluey became great friends. Then one day a most surprising thing happened. It had been a busy morning. One by one the customers had come and gone, and Joey had been singing his very best to them all. But now the shop was empty and all was quiet. The lady behind the counter was writing her customers' orders, when suddenly she heard a low, soft warbling and then a gentle trilling which grew louder and stronger as it went on. She glanced at the canary's cage but he was busily pecking his seed, and then she saw to her astonishment that it was Bluey, Bluey the budgerigar, singing, imitating the canary exactly but for the difference that he was not so shrill, his song was like a contralto version of the canary's.

The news of Bluey's singing soon got around. Even the newspaper men came to hear him and to write about him in the papers. Just fancy a 'Budgey' singing like that! 'How wonderful!' every one said, and as I myself listened to him I thought—'*That's what comes of a Budgey living with a Canary!*'

You remember the sad and sorry story of how Peter denied his Master. He was trying not to be recognized as he stood there in the court of the Judgment Hall where His enemies had taken Jesus, but it was no use. One who questioned him said, 'of a truth thou art one of them; for thy speech betrayeth thee.' Your accent gives you away!

Peter was a Galilean fisherman and his accent was unmistakable, as much so as a fisherman's from Brixham in Devon would be if heard in the streets of London. Peter had but to open his mouth and every one knew he belonged to Galilee.

But for three years he lived with Jesus and listened to Him, until Jesus came to mean more to Peter than anybody or anything else in the world. A rough-spoken Galilean fisherman! That was Peter. Perhaps he would never lose that Galilean accent, not entirely; and yet after living with Jesus and in spite of this sorry time, when in a moment of desperate anxiety he denied Him, one morning Peter began to speak with another accent. It was *the accent of Jesus*, that of a Christian. No longer the rough, boastful, self-assertive fisherman's talk but the Galilean accent of his Master, with all the sweet, soft harmony of love. You can read in St. John's Gospel, ch. 21 all about that wonderful morning when, after the Resurrection, Jesus showed Himself to His disciples.

What is your accent I wonder? Perhaps some one hearing you might say, 'Oh, he's a Cockney' or 'She's a lassie from Lancashire' or whatever it is; but living with Jesus and with those who love Him, listening to Jesus as you read your Bible or pray and think about Him, your's will be the Christian's accent. People about you will know at once, without your saying, that *you belong to Jesus*, that you are one of His company, that you *are* a Christian. This be our prayer—

Lord, speak to me, that I may speak
In living echoes of Thy tone.

The Christian Year

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

The Paradoxes of our Ministry

VII. 'As having nothing, and yet possesing all things'

BY THE REVEREND DOUGLAS STEWART, M.A., LONDON

The world in which we live is finite: the desire of man is infinite. There, on the most superficial level, lies the dilemma of materialism. How to satisfy an infinite hunger with a finite food. In some societies the solution attempted is the enrichment of the few and the impoverishment of the many. This would seem still to be the pattern followed in certain oil-producing states in modern times. But, more generally, modern man is committed to the more ambitious policy of satisfying the many. This has given to modern history a dynamism which is slightly fevered and easily becomes demonic. We have not measured the appetite of the humanity we are committed to appeasing.

It is saying the same thing in a more significant way to say that the world is material and man is spiritual. Paradoxically man cannot possess the world which he longs to possess. He cannot be enriched by material possessions. He has no way of assimilating them to his own being.

Here I stand in possession of a one pound note. I hold it in my hand and yet in no sense do I 'possess' it. It does not nourish or warm or illuminate me. But it is a symbol of exchange and in the exchange I may be enriched. I can buy food with my one pound note and that food will be assimilated by my body and therefore truly possessed. But notice at this point riches and poverty mean nothing. A rich man cannot eat more food than a poor man. He cannot, that is to say, possess more of the physical world. His body simply will not assimilate his riches.

There is a profound meaning in the story of the manna in the wilderness. When the Israelites gathered more than they could consume it went bad on them. We cannot physically possess more than we can eat. But the rich man is ensuring his future. He is in possession of the years to come. He is buying the spiritual food of security. So it may seem in the short term, but extend the scale of vision a little. 'Whose shall those things be?' In the mysterious pilgrimage of the human soul nothing—not the body itself—can be carried forward. The rich man is 'as having much, and yet possessing nothing.' As Frank Crane says, 'Millionaires collect objects as a dog collects fleas.' Unassimilated and irritating.

So what shall I do with my one pound note? For what shall I exchange it? I may buy a book, or a picture, or a record. In so doing I am taking a step towards true possession. I move into a realm of the spirit which is natural to me, the world of beauty, truth, and goodness in which I was created to live. But here the measure of possession is the measure of the self. Only as the self is given can the self receive.

The classical example of this is the confession of Charles Darwin that when, after a life devoted to scientific studies, he tried to return in old age to the literature and poetry he had enjoyed in his youth, he discovered that he was no longer capable of appreciating them. His power of assimilation had atrophied through disuse.

When we say that spiritual things are spiritually discerned we tend to think statically in terms of 'gifts.' Some have a gift for music, others for science, a few for religion. Without denying the fact of genuine 'gifts' there is a general gift given to each man in his creation to be a spiritual being. And the paradox of spirituality is that in the world of the spirit we only receive by giving. By giving ourselves to science, or art, or music, we enrich ourselves. The first motion is our self-emptying, our 'having nothing.'

Physical possession is always a shutting of the heart. To be rich you shut your heart against the needs of mankind. To satisfy your lust you shut your heart against your victim. To be great you 'shut the gates of mercy on mankind.' And that shutting ensures that you never in fact possess. The shining coin lies in the bottom of a bucket of water through which an electric current is passing. Your greedy hand is galvanized the moment you insert it. The clutch of possession cannot be unclenched, and you are clutching nothing.

'Sell all that thou hast,' said Jesus. Open your hand. Open your heart. 'Our heart is enlarged,' cried St. Paul. He was filled with love for the Corinthian Christians. Only love unclenches the hand and opens the heart. Only in love are we open to receive and to possess. The greater the love the more defenceless we become and the more enriched. The end state is 'as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.'

To return to an earlier paradox this is 'unknown, and yet well known.' At some point in life—in some area of human experience—all men know the truth of this. There is that to which a man is given and in which he is mysteriously enriched, his home, his particular study, his hobby, his hour of enlargement and joy. This needs interpreting because so few people understand it as the law of all life. It is at the point of love that we touch reality and the laws of love are much less arbitrary than the laws of Nature. What is true in the small field of home, or art, or hobby, is true to all eternity. We

have stumbled, without recognizing it, upon an outcrop of the great seam of wealth and joy which underlies our prosaic existence. If we could dispossess ourselves more and more of our defences and securities we would come to that love of God which is the possession of 'all things.'

Vera Brittain tells in *Testament of Friendship* a most moving story of an experience which came to Winifred Holtby towards the end of her life. She knew that she was dying and she went to stay for a time in Buckinghamshire. Out walking one winter's day she found some lambs struggling to drink from a trough which was frozen over. Winifred Holtby stopped and broke the ice with her stick and as she did so those words of St. Paul mysteriously surged up from the depths of her being as though some interior iceberg had been broken in her own heart, 'as dying, and, behold, we live; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.' She spoke of it later as her conversion.

Far too often we think and speak of conversion in terms of thought and not of action. We make it a matter of 'changing one's mind,' of 'decision for Christ,' of 'accepting the gospel.' Is that the right appeal? How can any of these take place without action, without some specific action which releases the pent-up flow of life within? Suppose Winifred Holtby had done nothing; had thought 'they too suffer. All living creatures are subject to death.' The flood of life within was waiting for the self-giving act, the act of compassion, to release it. Observe how our Lord commanded action. 'Stretch forth thy hand' to the man who couldn't stretch out his hand. 'Rise up and walk' to the man who couldn't walk. 'Sell all that thou hast.'

It is the security and the possessiveness of modern life which is the ultimate denial of the gospel. That same security and possessiveness is the doom of modern man. His riches are poverty: his security is danger. The gospel preacher remains the only realist in the world.

'As deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and, behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.'

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

The Search for Truth

BY THE REVEREND R. WATSON MATHEWSON, B.D., S.T.M., EDINBURGH

'Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth.' —Ja 1^{18}.

If Pilate asked the question, What is truth?, in jest, our generation does not treat it as a laughing matter; and if he did not stay for an answer, we go to endless pains to find one, in our quest setting up a multiplicity of commissions, tribunals, courts of inquiry, committees of investigation, panels, study-groups and public opinion polls.

For in every realm of life the pressure is on to arrive at truth before it is too late.

The pressure is on in the sciences. The days are not long enough for the men working in the laboratories and research stations. Forecasts of progress are out-of-date almost as soon as made.

The pressure is on in the affairs of nations for ultimately it is truth that is at stake in the contentions between powers and parties.

The pressure is on in the affairs of the Church, particularly in so far as the Church's unity depends on the dedication of all Christians to some larger truth than those around which each denomination revolves.

And is there not the same yearning for truth in the hearts of individual men and women?

The Arts, for one thing, suggest that there is. The acclaimed drama of to-day, for instance, though often sordid, is surely true to life in that it depicts with the realism of the prophet rather than of the photographer humanity desperately waiting for a truth that it believes to exist but cannot grasp. Waiting for Godot, or waiting for God.

Our own hearts tell the same tale. For we share in the uncertainty of our age in which so many of the former gilt-edged securities of life have proved themselves untrustworthy, and the half-truth and the lie masquerade as the whole truth. What are we to believe? In whom dare we trust? This is a generation that is of necessity searching for truth.

That is, of course, to its credit. It indicates that we are aware, if only dimly, that our world is being tested, and that a time of testing ought also to be a time of probing for truth. Pilate did not wait to hear his question answered in his time of testing. Jesus, on the other hand, took the same question with Him into the wilderness and wrestled with it there for forty days until He had His answer clear.

For the most part this search for truth in our day is being conducted not just for truth's sake, but for its benefits. The assumption is that its discovery will in some way set us free from the fears of our time, that it will beget new life in the world.

This is not an altogether false assumption. Truth does liberate; it is creative. Each new scientific discovery opens the door to further discoveries; each gain in knowledge creates the possibility of fuller, freer living.

But if we are hoping that advances in intellectual knowledge alone will give us the assurances we crave, we are heading for disappointment. For the hard-won experience of the ages confirms the

teaching of the Bible that though we have all knowledge and understand all mysteries it is still possible for the truth that really matters to elude us completely.

For while we must believe that all truth is given by God, clearly it comes to us in two kinds. Truth in the intellectual sense is not the whole of truth. Along with the knowledge He gives of His world, God offers us a knowledge of Himself. In imparting this knowledge He may use historical or scientific or theological truths as His servants, but ultimately it comes to us not as so many propositions but as creative words *spoken* to us, and, if we are willing to receive them, *heard* by us.

One of the most consistent and wonderful experiences of the committed Christian, for instance, is the daily inspiration of the Bible, the guidance, comfort and challenge of God's word. Again and again, with a frequency that belies coincidence, he finds that something in a passage from his book of daily readings, or from the commentary on it, comes home startlingly as truth for him.

It is not that he is given detailed directions as to how he ought to deal with difficult life-situations—to look for such is to open the door to superstition. But what he is given is a message that he recognizes with unshakable certainty to be meant for him. It may apply equally to many others or to the whole world, but in this instance it earths itself in his experience.

The words in which the message is framed are important enough, but the realization that takes his breath away is that they come to him not as written but as spoken words, not as oracles delivered long ago to the saints, but as addressed in the present to one who knows he is a sinner. It is the presence of the Speaker that authenticates what is said as the word of truth.

The content of the message is important enough, too, but even more so is what it tells of the graciousness of the One who speaks. 'Speak, that I may see thee,' said Ben Johnson.

So the message may be a promise, but its wonder resides not so much in what is promised as in the sheer goodness of God in making the promise at all. Or the message may be a challenge or judgment; but it is the indication that God is still sufficiently concerned about us, to warn or seek to change us, that is the real challenge, the real judgment.

Or the message may be a commission; but it will not be the nature of the commission so much as the humbling realization that He thinks us fit to be entrusted with it that will send us out hopefully and joyfully.

This is what we mean by revelation—the imparting of knowledge of Himself through a personal relationship that God graciously gives us in our Lord Jesus Christ.

Of this revelation the Bible is not, of course, the only medium. There is no limit to the means that God uses to convey His truth to a man. A burning bush, a child's questions, the serenity of an aged face, and we are on holy ground and must halt to hear what God the Lord will speak.

Nor is His revelation a gift to the individual alone. Again and again He has used a prayer-united group to communicate His truth to the world.

For the word of truth cannot be confined. Yet two qualities invariably belong to it. First, it is given to us in accordance with the law that rules the reception of all gifts from God. They are offered freely, but they must be asked for. They are not hidden, but they must be sought. It is the seeking mind that stumbles on scientific truth; it is the open heart that welcomes the Truth of God.

And, second, the voice that speaks this word of truth is always the voice of Christ. For He claims to be Himself the Truth, and once we receive Him as such we soon know that His claim is indeed true. Thus the word of truth begets the new life within us, for knowing leads to trusting, and trusting leads to freedom. And then our desire will be that our world, so desperately seeking saving truth to-day, should find it where we have found it, for its search will end nowhere if it does not end in Christ.

ROGATION SUNDAY

Doing It Together

BY THE REVEREND DAVID N. FRANCIS, M.A., LONDON

'When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with his disciples over the brook Cedron, where was a garden, into the which he entered.'—Jn 18^{1}.

'Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden. . . . There laid they Jesus.'—Jn $19^{41.\ 42}$.

The history of our world was cut in half by certain things that happened nineteen hundred years ago. And that period of supreme crisis had within it its own crises. One was the point where Jesus, the one truly whole Son of God, finally gave Himself in utter obedience to His Father's will. The other was the point at which the fruits of that obedience became manifest—fruits that were destined to turn the world upside down. And these twin focal points in world history have something significant in common.

'*There* was a *garden*.' The great self-offering in Gethsemane, *and* the conquest of death, Christ's triumphant return—both things happened in a garden. It would seem that God is specially 'at home,' and His glory particularly manifest, in a garden. So it was 'in the beginning'; and the Hebrews have left us a vivid picture of God 'walking in the garden in the cool of the day.'

Why is God specially fond of gardens? Why is His Spirit apparently liberated there in a particularly rich way? Surely because there, in a garden, God and Man must needs work *together*. A garden is a unique example of co-operation. We have all heard the story of the vicar who gently reproved his parishioner for boasting about what 'he' had done in his garden. 'Not you alone, surely! You and God together!' To which the gardener replied with irony: 'You ought to have seen it when God had it on His own!' I have never felt that that story is really fair to God! Yet it brings home this truth: that where gardens are concerned God does need the co-operation of Man.

Here is a paradox. God is indeed almighty—yet there are some things He cannot do. Rather, perhaps, we should say that quite deliberately He has limited Himself; knowing that the best things *would not be* the best things unless achieved by a combined operation. He has so planned life that its highest values can only be reached when we work together with Him. Let us see how this works out in the two greatest tasks of all.

First, in the making of 'new' men and women. The Church in its early days was greatly troubled by the teaching of a monk called Pelagius. Yet we can sympathize with Pelagius. In effect he said: 'Don't go whining to God for help. He has shown you the way, and given you the resources you need. Choose the right manfully, stand on your own feet, work out your own salvation!' This half-truth was dangerous teaching. But, as so often, in correcting the Pelagian heresy the Church tended to fall into error at the other extreme; even Augustine urging that all was from God and nothing from Man, that it was impious to imagine that God needed us or that we had a contribution to make. The work was His alone! There is a sense in which this is ultimately true—but, again, not the whole truth. To sit back and leave all to God is as bad a heresy as 'Pelagianism.'

To-day both extremes have their followers. Many ardent souls, on the one hand, are vigorously trying to 'build Jerusalem' *for* God rather than *with* God. And many young people, especially, throw themselves enthusiastically into the work of the Kingdom without much reference to their King. On the other hand, there are some devout Christians to whom all this man-made effort is both futile and unnecessary, because God has everything in hand.

Let us learn from our gardening that we need God and—yes!—God needs us. A friend of mine in Hereford grows roses. On the rose that God has made he too lavishes his attention. His life is devoted to a painstaking study of the rose's ways; to testing and tending, to pruning and perfecting. And the final product, in which his friends can delight, is the fruit again of a combined operation. So it is with the saving and sanctifying of a human soul. Remember Paul's advice to his friends at Philippi. 'Work out *your own* salvation!' he writes; and then adds 'but with awe and trembling.' Why? 'Because *it is God who is working* within you!'

Dare we believe what can be achieved if we work together with God? Look at the sheer loveliness of the flowers. Then let us remind ourselves that they are a pointer; that there may be a comparable loveliness *within us*, that our inner life may be a living, growing and fragrant 'garden.' This is what God purposes for us.

The other great task confronting us is the making of a new world, the establishing of God's kingship 'on earth as it is in heaven.' Here, too, the same truth holds. Kipling tells us that 'our England is a garden.' So is the world as a whole; or rather, that is God's plan for it. Yet at the moment the world doesn't look very much like a garden. It reminds me much more of the jungle area I used to work in in India. It presented a vivid contrast. On the one hand much of it had been 'left to God.' It was wild—and wasted; untamed and untapped. On the other hand, there was one area like a concentrated sample of our own Black Country, where coal was being mined, and where a squalid scramble for material gain was going on amidst an unlovely slum; Man leaving God out of the picture.

What God envisages for our world is so very different; 'The desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. . . . The glowing sand shall become a pool, the thirsty ground springs of water . . . the redeemed shall walk there . . .' (Is 35). And these things *shall be*! Then why are they not happening more quickly? Because God is waiting—is bound to wait—for us.

Some things are clear. One is that *we must work*. There are disquieting signs around us that this is an unpopular idea. Our generation is gripped by twin obsessions: to do less and get more for doing it. Strikes are staged to exclude those tactless enough to work really hard. A signalman leaves his box forty minutes early, to go home. And so that a subsidy may be claimed for another night out, a trawler drifts to destruction within sight of harbour, while captain and crew play cards below deck. *We must work.*

And this also is needful, that we work *for the glory of the garden*. Our labour must not be for ourselves, but as a conscious contribution towards the accomplishing of God's plan. A part secret of Germany's phenomenal recovery to-day is the faith of her people in something *beyond themselves*, and their determination to get there.

We shall have to *work His way*, too. For God's garden much of our work will have to be on a

spiritual plane. We shall find ugly rifts, made by misunderstanding and misrepresentation, to be bridged and filled in. The garden is strewn, too, with great boulders of injustice, of hate and fear which must be removed. There are bare and barren tracks which must somehow be transformed by a new inflow of generosity and helpfulness. And as we work, He will work with us.

But perhaps I am talking too big ? This world picture seems far removed from our immediate scene. Then let us bring it all down to a local focus. Within God's great garden we have a tiny part assigned to us, a little ' allotment,' as it were —in the road where we live, the place where we work. If we will look to our planting and watering, we may be sure that God will do His part, and ' make things grow.'

My mind goes back to a scene of years ago. Father calls small daughter to help him push the pram. Proudly disdaining assistance she says ' *I* do ! ' and father reluctantly stands back. Progress is negligible, and tears are near. In despair she gives up : ' *You* do ! ' A little sadly—for this wasn't the plan—father moves to take over. And then, with a flash of inspiration and a gleam in her eye, small daughter cries, ' Let's do it *together* ! ' And with two pairs of hands on the job the pram leaps forward.

One day we shall all learn the same lesson. And then through all our earth will be seen the glory of the garden. As in the beginning, so at the end, God will walk in His garden ; glad in the flowers there—His people—and in the soil—the rich fellowship in which they grow. And we shall be glad too if in our own small corner, with our own hands and on our knees, we have helped to create that loveliness. Let's do it *together* !

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION

Prayer—The Christian's Handy Weapon

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT MENZIES, D.D., GLASGOW

' Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints ; And for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel. For which I am an ambassador in bonds : that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.'—Eph 6^{18-20}.

Two classes of people seem greatly to have interested Paul—soldiers and athletes. Many of his illustrations are drawn from the Pan-Hellenic athletic contests or from the military craft. In the passage before us it is the latter which engages his attention. He has before his eyes the Roman legionaries on the march. Their hardihood was due to the rigorous discipline they underwent, and their efficiency to their superb equipment.

The Christian also, like the Roman soldier, goes forth to war, and in the view of Paul is equally equipped for the struggle. Point by point he can match Rome's weapons. He has an equivalent for every article of his—the breastplate of righteousness, the girdle of truth, the shield of faith, the sword of the spirit, shoes shod with the preparedness of the gospel of peace. He has all these weapons at his disposal, and he has still another, denied to the Roman soldier, what Paul calls ' All-prayer.' This is an all-inclusive weapon. It can be used equally for defence or attack. It can be used at any time, at all times, in any place and on all occasions. It is the Christian's handy weapon. Let us consider a little more fully the ' why,' the ' when ' and the ' where ' of prayer.

1. *The ' Why ' of Prayer.* Paul in this passage makes it abundantly clear why we should keep this weapon in constant use. The reason is that as Christians we are ceaselessly engaged in a struggle between right and wrong, and there is no ground between these two except battle ground. This war against evil is not a phoney war but a sinister and menacing reality. It is war carried on simultaneously at least on two fronts. The war is within us, in our own hearts, in the ceaseless conflict between the flesh and the spirit, in our fears, distrusts, reluctances, in our hostility to the will of God. The warfare is also without, in the evil forces that environ us and dwell in the heart of society.

Paul suggests here that the warfare extends to a third front, and is being waged with fury in the unseen world. ' Our wrestling is not merely with flesh and blood but with the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places.' It is only when we recognize the magnitude of the forces arrayed against us that we begin to appreciate the importance of prayer. To meet successfully such a fierce ordeal we need every spiritual weapon at our disposal, but especially All-prayer. It is the all-availing weapon because it is by its means that we maintain our connexion with the source of all power. If in any sense we are to be warrior-saints of God, then we cannot dispense with this weapon. I wonder if you can guess the source of this quotation : ' Once again we face a state of peril and dread. Do not blame humanity for this. Do not blame God. Do not lay the blame at any one's door. The cause is clear. It is practical atheism. Above all it is disregard of prayer.' The quotation is from a leading article in a London daily newspaper. The article concludes : ' Now is the time for faith. Now is the time for prayer.' When the secular Press turns preacher and issues an urgent summons to prayer, it is time for the believer to look to his weapons and in particular ' All-prayer.'

2. *The 'When' of Prayer.* At what times ought we to engage in this exercise, and how frequently? Jesus' answer is that 'men ought *always* to pray and not to faint.' Paul urges the Thessalonians to 'pray without ceasing.' And here in this passage before us his counsel to the Ephesians is the same. 'Praying always.' This, however, is not an easy thing to do. In fact it looks like a counsel of perfection. How can a man engage in secular affairs, run his business, care for his home, converse with his friends and at the same time hold unbroken converse with the Unseen, and give his strength to the things that belong to God. Observe, however, carefully what Paul says. His exact words are 'Praying always with all prayer and supplication *in the Spirit.*' Paul's demand is not for articulate speech but for a right disposition towards God. What he is pleading for is not *so much* definite acts of petition as for the cultivation of the atmosphere in which all prayer should be offered. It is the settled poise of the soul God-ward. John in the Book of Revelation speaks of the voice of Jesus as being 'like the sound of many waters.' It is a vivid way of describing the influence of Jesus as being like the voice of the sea, all-pervasive yet never obtrusive, filling the interstices of space, yet scarcely heard except in moments of silence. So the spirit of prayer may so wrap round the soul that, although it never breaks into vocal speech, it is yet conscious of the presence of God in the background, forming like the voice of the sea a kind of running accompaniment to all one's thoughts. So constantly present is this besetting presence, and so near to us, that at the slightest provocation it may emerge into clear consciousness. Take this, for example, out of the private papers of Sir Thomas Browne—'Resolved to pray in all places where quietness inviteth; in any house, highway or street . . . and that no parish or town where I have been may not say that I have forgotten God or my Saviour in it. To take occasion of praying at any Church which I see or pass by. To pray daily and particularly for all my sick patients and for all sick people under whose care soever. And, at the entrance into the house of the sick to say—the peace and the mercy of God be upon this house, after a sermon to make a prayer and desire a blessing, and to pray for the minister,' etc. To one steeped in the atmosphere of prayer, as this saintly physician was, it would seem natural that he should pray without ceasing.

3. Finally, consider *the 'Where' of Prayer.* What is the locus of prayer, its sphere of reference, the object or objects to which it is directed? For whom and what should we pray? We should pray for ourselves, for we obviously stand in need of heaven's support. We are frail children of dust and feeble as frail. We need the cleansing, renewing and fortifying power of the Holy Spirit given by God in response to our prayers. We ought also to pray for persons specifically known to us, and especially for those in key-positions that they may use their influence wisely and savingly. It was Paul's definite conviction that the prayers of Ephesian friends would have definite repercussions in Rome, and profoundly influence the success of his evangelical mission there. It would have the effect of opening doors that might otherwise be closed, and of enlarging the dimensions of his work in Rome. We ought to pray not only for specific persons but for all, known and unknown to us, who against great odds are holding the Christian front. 'Make supplication for all saints' is Paul's counsel to the Ephesians and to us. These saints, whether known or unknown, are to-day scattered through the habitable globe, just as in Paul's time they were to be found everywhere along the Mediterranean littoral. The fight for them is as fierce and the battle as long as it was for the Ephesians. Let them take to themselves therefore the whole armour of God. Let them use every weapon, but in particular the weapon of prayer. For prayer produces objective results. It makes God's power present and operative where before it was absent. It acts dynamically on men, events and causes. It strengthens feeble men like ourselves with might in the inner man of the heart. It gives us the power 'to withstand in the evil day, and having done all to stand.'

Recent Foreign Theology

Bibliography of Biblical Studies. Attention has been called in these columns to an indispensable tool for Biblical research which began to appear a few years ago, under the title *Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete.* The issue covering the years 1955–56 has now appeared.[1] It lists sixteen hundred and eighty articles which appeared in journals and *Festschriften* and similar works, followed in almost every case by a shorter or longer comment, in German, French or English, indicating the substance of the article. No individual scholar can have access to so vast a number of articles, but any one engaged on the study of any particular subject can quickly find out from this classified bibliography what has appeared on his subject

[1] Vol. IV, Heft 1–2 [1957]. Patmos Verlag, Düsseldorf; DM. 38.

within the given period. Twenty-seven scholars have collaborated in the preparation of this volume, and there is a welcome change in the method adopted. In previous volumes the list of works covered was given at the beginning and each supplied with a number. At the end of each summary the location of the article summarized or mentioned was indicated by the number, so that in each case the reader had to refer to the key at the beginning to find where the article appeared. Now standard abbreviations are used, so that in a large number of cases the reader will know without consulting the key where they are to be found, and will only have to consult the key for journals and other publications which lie outside the range of his acquaintance. Every good theological library should take this work, and every scholar engaged on serious research in the Biblical field should use it.

A. Robert Memorial Volume. What had been planned as a *Festschrift* for A. Robert, who succeeded L. Pirot as the editor of the highly important *Supplément* to Vigouroux's *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, has had to be turned into a memorial volume [1] through the death of Father Robert while the work was in preparation. It is a large volume of nearly six hundred pages. It contains no less than fifty-seven articles on subjects connected with the Old and New Testaments and their background, including several articles on the Dead Sea Scrolls. The writers are drawn from many countries, and amongst the British and American contributors are Albright, Dodd, Driver, and W. D. Davies. German contributors include Elliger, Eissfeldt, Noth, and Nötscher. To summarize all the articles is here impossible, or even to list all the titles or all the authors, and it must suffice to mention the subjects of a few articles, which are likely to interest many readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. Noth writes on David and Israel in the much discussed 2 S 7, and Coppens on the Hassidic Psalms, while Tournay deals with some of the rubrics of the Psalms. The Jewish scholar Yeivin writes on the wars with Jabin of Hazor, and Bonsirven on the Kingdom of God according to the Old Testament. Qumran studies come from Nötscher, Vermès, van der Ploeg, Delcor, and the present writer. Dodd writes on the Beatitudes, and Daniélou on the Good Samaritan, while Lyonnet writes on St. Paul and contemporary Jewish exegesis. W. D. Davies in one of the longest articles—far exceeding the length laid down by the editor—deals with Mt $5^{17f.}$. Every Biblical student is likely to find something to his taste in this volume.

[1] *Mélanges Bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert* [1957]. Bloud et Gay, Paris; Fr. 2000.

Qumran Hymns. One of the many books on the Dead Sea Scrolls was written by Dr. Georg Molin, giving a general account of the Scrolls and a translation into German of the texts available at the time.[2] Only a few of the Hymns of Praise had then been published and some extracts from others of the Hebrew University texts. More recently the Hymns and the Battle Scroll have been published in full, and so Dr. Molin has now published a small volume containing a translation of all these Hymns, together with similar hymns contained in the Manual of Discipline and the Battle Scroll.[3] There is a short introduction and some very brief notes, but the main contents of the book are the translations. The Hymns themselves are in many respects similar to psalms in the Psalter, and most of them begin 'I will praise thee, O Lord.' English readers now have the excellent translations of Professor Gaster available, with which Dr. Molin's may be compared. The renderings are attractive, and the Hymns show spiritual feeling. There are no clear references to the Teacher of Righteousness or to historical situations, and the Hymns are less significant for the understanding of the practices of the sect or relations with the New Testament than some others of the texts. It has been supposed that some were composed by the Teacher of Righteousness, who is mentioned in them, but of this there is no evidence.

The Tetragrammaton. To the many studies of the Tetragrammaton a Dutch writer, Dr. M. Reisel, has added one more.[4] The writer holds that Ex 3^{14} should be translated 'I shall (show to) be who I would show to be,' and maintains that the Tetragrammaton means 'He who indeed will (show to) be.' He avoids the plain implications of Ex 6^{3} by the wholly artificial rendering 'By Abraham, Isaac and Jacob I was seen as El Shaddai, but as for my YHWH-personality I was not acknowledged by them.' The original pronunciation of the Divine name is held to have been Yehūáh, but by a process of reasoning which the present writer cannot follow. One stage in the reasoning is that the imperfect of הוה/היה was originally *yahūwu*, on the analogy of *yaqūmu* from קום. But the analogy is a false one, since one is a hollow verb and the other is not. Despite the doubtfulness of its theses, this book will be useful by reason of the material it contains and the references to other literature; but it should be used with extreme care. H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester University

[2] *Die Söhne des Lichtes.*

[3] *Lob Gottes aus der Wüste : Lieder und Gebete aus den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* [1957]. Karl Alber, Freiburg im Breisgau.

[4] *The Mysterious Name of Y.H.W.H.* (*Studia Semitica Neerlandica*, No. 2) [1957]. Van Gorcum, Assen.

Entre Nous

The Happy Warrior

There are some men—and those among the greatest—whose greatness lies not in anything they know, and not in anything that they have done, but entirely in what they are. Such was Edward Woods as he appears in *The Life of Edward Woods*, by Canon Oliver Tomkins (S.C.M.; 25s. net). Edward Woods in his life played many parts—student at Cambridge, Chaplain of Ridley Hall, Chaplain to the Royal Military College at Sandhurst, Vicar of Holy Trinity Church at Cambridge, Leader of the Life and Liberty Movement, Vicar of the great parish of Croydon, and finally Bishop of Lichfield. In this biography Edward Woods comes vividly alive.

He was above all things an enthusiast who saw God in everything. 'For Edward, God was so much to be found in *all* of life that religion was only one of its joys, whilst God was joy itself. So rowing and tennis, walks and friends, music and work, all were joyfully accepted, and offered to God in praise.' Plunged into the work of Holy Trinity, Cambridge, and in demand as a speaker all over England, he writes characteristically: 'All the same it is awful fun and I love it, and just adore going full steam ahead.' But in the midst of his multifarious activities he is suddenly drawn up by Maurice Richmond, 'saying frankly that I give him the impression less of a "collected Galilaean" than of "an under-staffed American office!"'

No man ever had in fuller measure the gift of being all things to all men. There can be few future bishops who have given their testimony at a Salvation Army meeting. He had a Cambridge friend, a 'cabbie', George Dean by name, 'who played the trombone in the Salvation Army. It was like Edward to go with his friend to a Salvation Army meeting, and, having got there, to bear his testimony, with others, to love for a Saving Lord.' At one moment we find him on one of his pilgrimages through his diocese 'sheltering for a few moments in a little pub' and talking to the inn-keeper who recognized the Bishop by his voice which he had often heard on the radio. 'So of course', writes the Bishop, 'we made great friends.' At another moment we find him writing to his family after a glittering lunch at the Dorchester: 'I am quite prepared to penetrate any night-clubs, beer cellars or other such places if, on the evangelistic scent, I can pursue and kill my quarry in such places.' There was no place where Edward Woods was not at home, and no man whom he could not get alongside.

He was not himself a great scholar; but he had the gift of kindling fires in other peoples' hearts. He quotes a passage from *The Times* which explained our victory in the First World War more in terms of moral ardour than of skill and which illustrated this moral ardour from the victorious commanders of the past: 'Blucher, Zielen and others were very far from being military geniuses. Their intelligence was not of the first order, their intellect was limited, but the internal flame which inspired them sufficed for all.' Edward Woods had his share of the internal flame. He himself used an illustration which is very apt in these days when Church Union is an absorbing question: 'Once on a visit to a factory for making machine tools I watched two pieces of very hard steel being welded together. In their previous cold state no combining was possible. Once they were both white hot the welding was easy.' Even so!

But the very keynote and atmosphere of the life of Edward Woods was love. In 1946 he went on a long and exhausting tour of the troops on the Continent, and he writes quite unselfconsciously: 'I just gave away my soul to them.' When news of his death came during a Bishops' Meeting, the Archbishop of Canterbury broke the news to his brother bishops and said: 'I think that we can truly say that Edward Woods was always on the side of the angels, *all* the angels, *all* the time.' And in his Preface the author of this biography says: 'It mattered little, as the years went by, that in many ways one disagreed with him. His great gift was neither intellectual originality nor balanced statesmanship (so uniquely blended in his great colleague, William Temple). Edward's gift was that he made things *lovable*.' And after all is not love the greatest of these?

Canon Tomkins has succeeded in writing a biography in which the sheer lovableness of his subject shines through, and we are grateful for the story of a life which restores one's faith in men.

One statement from the diary of Thornton Douglas intrigues us. It describes a campaign of open-air preaching at Knapwell and finishes: 'Back 9 miles in 35 minutes praising God and running into a Proctor.' There lies an unrecorded world's record for long distance running!

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.